

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, before whom the angels gather in praise and adoration, we bow in the glow of our national Thanksgiving Day; bless everyone with the mercy of a grateful heart; open the floodgates and let a great tide surge through our breasts. Thou art unto us the one clear place of refuge amid the ruined systems of this world, haunted by hate and revenge.

Thou who didst lead our fathers to these shores that they might lay here the foundations of a civil and religious liberty, bless to us the glorious heritage of faith and freedom which we have received from them. Preserve Thou the Nation which was established by their prayers, heroic deeds, and sacrifices. Help us to be true to the great ideals for which they stood and may our country ever be the home of justice, liberty, and true brotherhood. Defend it against every peril and may it be increasingly a blessing to all the world. In the name and spirit of our blessed Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 24, 1943, was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to find out, if I can, what the program will be for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no program for next week except that on either Monday or Tuesday there are some bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia to be considered. If the chairman of that committee desires that the bills be considered on Tuesday instead of Monday I hope the House will give unanimous consent that that be

done. I understand he intends to bring up three noncontroversial bills. I do not know specifically what the bills are, but last Wednesday he told me there were three bills he wanted to bring up next week.

Outside of that, there is no legislation to be considered next week other than noncontroversial matters, for whose consideration unanimous consent may be sought, but I have no knowledge of any such now. However, those things develop from time to time. Of course, for a bill to be considered by unanimous consent it must have a unanimous committee report, the minority members must be agreeable to taking it up for consideration, and the minority leadership must be agreeable to it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Dorothy Thompson, and further to extend my remarks and include a brief article from Time magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 369), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation by the select committee created by House Resolution 21, not to exceed \$50,000 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order of 15 minutes today. I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 10 minutes in which to

answer the turkey dinner smear articles that were put in a Washington paper and a Detroit paper, one by Helen Esary and the other by Blair Moody.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Arthur Krock that appeared in the New York Times November 18, 1943, in regard to the Kefauver resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a story on Nebraska issued by the State of Nebraska, regardless of the length of the article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Lee Carson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEND-LEASE AND NYLONS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration of Lend-Lease has perpetrated many sins of commission and omission, and the more that I see personally of the operation of that particular body, the more I feel that it should be investigated very thoroughly.

May I quote from Cedric Adams, commentator of the Minneapolis Star-Journal, from his column, In This Corner, of Friday, November 19:

This sort of thing makes you wonder. Mrs. R. F. Ross, of Walker, Minn., has forwarded a copy of the Auckland Star, a daily newspaper published in New Zealand. And the following excerpt is what hits us in the

eye: "Thousands of pairs of nylon stockings will be on sale in Australia within the next 3 months. Supplies are being sent from America under the lend-lease agreement with the United States and will be released through the clothing commission."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from an address by Mr. Paul Bellamy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, charges have been made repeatedly on the floor of the House that the Corn Belt farmer is hoarding corn to the disadvantage and discrimination against poultry and egg producers of other sections of the country. I deny this allegation.

I now charge unfair discrimination against the Corn Belt farmer, in that now there are no ration points on poultry or eggs, while the Corn Belt farmer has a heavy ration point placed on his product.

Sixteen ration points per week per person consumes but very little beef, pork, lamb, all meat products, butter, and cheese. While at the same time, you can buy all the poultry and eggs you want without any rationing points.

No wonder the packers' refrigerators are overloaded and are now asking the farmer to hold his hogs from the market. No wonder everyone is getting tired of chicken and are hungry for a real steak or ham steak—yes, even a good hamburger, but you will have to take an egg sandwich instead.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks, including two letters, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article concerning cotton, and another to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter by L. Welch Pogue written to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, today, the first day after this Thanksgiving, I am not thinking and criticizing my Government for each and everything that anybody who is opposed to it for a partisan purpose may do, but I am thinking of the American Army, the men of the American Army and the American Navy who yesterday and the day before won great victories for their country.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and for permission to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, while I hold no brief for the whisky drinkers of the United States, my attention has been drawn to the fact that the Senate subcommittee is investigating a real, or alleged, shortage of whisky in this country.

I am no expert in the distillation of whisky, nor am I learned in the science of chemistry, but I have been reliably informed that most of our domestic whisky is made up of 40 percent aged whisky and 60 percent ethyl alcohol.

The shortage of whisky is alleged to be due to the fact that all of the distilleries in the United States are now producing industrial alcohol for war purposes. It is made from sugar, sirups, or cereals. The cost of this alcohol, I understand, runs as high as 80 or 90 cents a gallon.

Canada is producing the same alcohol from waste sulfite liquor, a byproduct of the pulp mills, at a cost of 16 cents a gallon. When the Canadian alcohol plant was opened, I am informed, a big celebration was held, and the alcohol produced in this plant formed the principal ingredient of a beverage served at a large cocktail party. A few drops of juniper juice added to a gallon of alcohol, I am informed, makes a fair grade of bathtub gin.

It does seem to me that inasmuch as we have a superabundance of this waste sulfite liquor in the United States, it would be an act of common sense and prudence to convert it to alcohol and save the grain for other purposes; especially in view of the fact that the War Production Board has been considering for nearly 2 years an offer made by a reputable company to produce alcohol from waste sulfite liquor at a cost of approximately 18 or 20 cents a gallon. Why should we pay 80 cents a gallon, when we can buy it at 18 cents a gallon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered

by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] on the 12th of November.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include some brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks with respect to veterans' legislation recently enacted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks briefly with respect to a correction in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article by Dr. Will P. Kennedy, of the Washington Star, with reference to the first meeting of Congress in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain editorials and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HON. FRANK KNOX

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this moment to pay my respects to and to express my admiration for our Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Knox. In 1940, when he was requested to accept the post of Secretary of the Navy, in accepting he said:

It makes little difference what happens to me, but what happens to our country makes all the difference.

I shall not be able to add to his fame or raise him to a higher place in the deserved estimation of his fellow citizens, but I shall be able to answer to a call of duty on my own part when I rise to speak my own mind, and this I do now, asserting that in my opinion there is not a man in America who exceeds or excels him in degree or quality of patriotism or love of country.

If it has been necessary, or has had such an effect, he has buried every personal consideration or hope of political preferment that he might serve his country. I honor him for this, and he de-

serves the gratitude and good will of every American citizen.

THE LATEST BOOK: ONE MAN—WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, honest Americans at home, as well as soldiers in the field, will be shocked to read a book just out called One Man—Wendell Willkie, an exposé of the criminal rigging of the Republican convention at Philadelphia in 1940.

It was written by a leading Ohio Republican, Hon. C. Nelson Sparks, of Akron, former mayor of that city.

It reveals the greatest saturnalia of fraud, bribery, and corruption in the history of American politics, one that makes the Teapot Dome scandal look like a Sunday school affair.

It should be investigated by Congress at once, preferably by the United States Senate, since it not only refers to certain Senators who were leading candidates for the Presidential nomination and were the victims of the Philadelphia debauchery, but it also reveals a scheme to use the corrupt Willkie machine to purge, in the Democratic primaries next year, certain Senators whom those racketeers cannot bluff, bribe, or intimidate.

If these revelations are permitted to go unnoticed by the Congress of the United States, it will be notice to the world that political morality in America has degenerated to the vanishing point.

ONE MAN—WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. I have asked for this 1 minute in order to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] if it is not likely that there may be just a little partisan prejudice in his emotions at this moment.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say in response to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] that there is not. I am merely quoting the words used by a leading Republican from Ohio who is telling about the bribery and corruption at the Republican convention that nominated Willkie at Philadelphia.

Mr. McLEAN. That is an answer. Nobody would ever suspect there would be any partisan thought in the mind of the enthusiastic gentleman from Mississippi when a matter of this kind arises.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman that I was quoting a leading Republican who was shocked at the way Willkie was forced onto the Republicans by a corrupt machine.

Mr. McLEAN. You have answered my question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that Friday is not a proper laundry day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Record and show to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] that this is a Republican leader of Ohio, who wrote this book, One Man—Wendell Willkie. This book may not be the best seller, but it certainly ought to be classed as the "worst smeller," as a result of the rottenness it turns up.

I hope the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] will read it, for I am sure he would not condone the outrageous practices resorted to by the Willkie machine at Philadelphia.

Mr. KNUTSON. I renew my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial on silver.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to an article that appeared in the Washington Post this morning, which is very unfair to Chairman DOUGHTON and the Committee on Ways and Means. I regret that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is not here, because I think he could do a better job of skinning than I can. Unfortunately, he is absent from the city over the week end, being at his home in North Carolina. His work in preparing and passing the tax bill justifies the high esteem in which he is held in this House and by the country.

Anyone who knows the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] knows that he would not lend himself to slipping over jokers in any bill that comes from his committee. The article in the Post insinuates that this was done. Ordinarily Bob Albright, the author of this article, is very well informed and fair, but in this instance he has taken an unfair advantage and, in addition, has written an article that is not accurate nor historically correct. The article that I am referring to is headed "Revenue bill accounting joker makes labor howl—Green protests House requirement for yearly union financial report."

In the body of the article I read:

The American Federation of Labor detected the sleeper too late to block it in the House, but President William Green filed a protest with House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Further on in the article this statement is made:

There was ample indication the Ways and Means Committee knew what it was about and it was determined to get at union profit data for possible future tax purposes.

What are the facts? This particular item in the tax bill that we passed on Wednesday was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means on three different occasions, and after each meeting where we considered this particular section of the bill the chairman, as is his custom, held a press conference and in his conference he stated to the press—and I call upon the members in the press gallery to bear me out—the chairman frankly and openly stated to the press that the section in the revenue bill compelling all organizations to file financial returns of receipts and disbursements with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue included all organizations save religious and educational. Asked by Bob Humphreys, of I. N. S., if it included labor unions, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] said it did.

In this connection it may be pertinent to state that on November 19 the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman DOUGHTON, accompanied by several members of the Committee on Ways and Means, appeared before the Committee on Rules at a public hearing to ask for a rule to govern consideration of the revenue measure in the House 5 days later. Let me read from the record of that hearing. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], a member of the Rules Committee, was interrogating.

Mr. HALLECK. On page 28, section 112 speaks of returns by organizations exempt from taxation. What kinds of organizations will file those?

Mr. KNUTSON. I believe every kind except religious and educational.

Mr. HALLECK. How about labor unions?

Mr. KNUTSON. They will file. The purpose is to make them file returns so that we can see what the intake and outgo are. It is for our guidance in the future. There is a loophole there that should be closed.

Mr. Speaker, at least a half dozen newspapermen covered this hearing. Members of the House, I submit that this short excerpt from the committee hearings utterly refutes all insinuations that anything was "slipped over." If anything it would indicate that someone was asleep at the switch.

It is unfortunate that the Post was not aware of what had transpired, because I want to assume that the Post seeks to be fair. There was nothing hidden, neither did we try to hide anything. The press was kept fully informed of every move that we made in executive session, and any unbiased representative in the press gallery will bear me out in that statement. It is strange that Mr. Green did not know what was going on in the committee as other labor organizations did.

My only purpose in taking the floor is to refute this story because it reflects upon one of the most lovable and one of the most useful, honorable, and upright men in this House.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The letter that is referred to was sent with the request that it be communicated to the Members; and the gentleman knows that in my remarks I said:

I am in receipt of a letter from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, protesting against the provisions of section 112 of the pending bill. Any views or opinions of Mr. Green are always worthy of deep consideration. We all admit that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; and they usually come by freight. Go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. I further said:

This letter states the position of the A. F. of L. in opposition to section 112. In the event that the Senate amends section 112 in a manner satisfactory to the A. F. of L. I know the contents of this letter will have the serious consideration of the House conferees when the bill is in conference.

I was surprised myself when I read that statement this morning.

Mr. KNUTSON. It was entirely uncalled for and unfair.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, and if any mistake is made it is an honest mistake and in the regular legislative processes we will be able to correct it. I join with the gentleman from Minnesota in his expression of proper, courteous, and respectful resentment at the implications contained in the article.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say to the majority leader that no mistake was made. We only did what should have been done 20 or 30 years ago.

GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, much as I deplore the treatment of a shell-shocked veteran in a hospital by Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, I deplore almost as much the overemphasis and the publicity given to this episode 3½ months later which can only undermine the morale of the people back home and interfere with the greatest need of all, which is unity in winning this war. In the stress of modern war a general's nerves may become frayed the same as those of men in the ranks. It is not for us on the home front to attempt to indulge in back-seat driving and criticize those who are responsible for winning victories. I know General Patton personally; I have seen him with his troops. I believe he is the greatest fighting officer in the Army of the United States, and the Lord knows we need fighting generals. He has apologized to the individual, he has apologized to the staff of the hospital, he has apologized humbly to his entire division. What else do you want? I say to you that there is no greater, two-fisted fighting man in our Army, and I hope there will be no more publicity in the press and magazines because it can only be harmful. I should like to see this matter left to the military authorities and not paraded in the newspapers in the interest of national unity, Army morale, and winning the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. Lecompte. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a resolution of the League of Iowa Municipalities at a meeting in Iowa City on November 5 last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Rowe] is recognized for 45 minutes.

THE O. P. A. RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, it has been said to me on more than one occasion that the Well of this House is a place of danger. I am sure my friends who so advised me were acting in good faith and were giving first consideration to my political well-being. I was impressed with their statements concerning the high political mortality rate of those who in the past had frequented this place in which I stand. A single terse sentence made here, though with good intent and faith, can prove to be the political death sentence of its author. So, being fully apprehensive of this danger, I subject myself to its utmost possibility. Imbued with temerity because the inalienable right in the pursuit of happiness of one of my constituents is threatened and the power of the great deliberative, legislative body is challenged, I bring to your attention today a matter of grave importance.

I quote the preamble of Food Distribution Order 27:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by Executive Order 9280, dated December 5, 1942, and to assure an adequate supply and efficient distribution of meat, beef, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton to meet war and essential civilian needs, it is hereby ordered as follows—

Thereafter follows more than 3,000 words of definitions and restrictive prohibitions based on sanitary procedure and previous records for the small slaughterer and farmer.

Now, acting under the authority of this order, an area supervisor sent the following registered letter to my constituent to whom I have heretofore referred, and I quote:

The evidence which you have submitted in support of your slaughter quota base, as set out in your application for a permit, has been carefully reviewed. Upon consideration of this evidence, it has been found that it is insufficient to justify a quota base, and accordingly you are hereby notified that your permit has been recommended to the War Food Administration, Regional Office, Chicago, Ill., for cancellation. If the regional director concurs with this recommendation, you will be notified as to the effective date of cancellation. If you wish to appeal from this decision, you should file your appeal in triplicate with the County War Meat Committee, and it will be forwarded to the appropriate person for action.

Mr. Speaker, that letter has blasted into smithereens the hopes, the aspirations and the future of a man and his family just as surely as if he and his family were in the path of this modern age's most devastating military machine

of destruction. That statement may seem a little far-fetched, but I would call to your attention the words of an English writer that "freedom and life are coexistent."

I fully appreciate the emergencies and the exigencies of a war program require hard and drastic rules, but a true and effective war effort can never be realized with the wheels of justice out of balance or the gateway of reasonable freedom to the people locked shut by a non-understanding fixed authority.

This constituent to whom I have referred is symbolic of the true character of generations past which have acquitted themselves with real credit for constructive effort in the historical progress of this great Nation. He is but one of millions who feel the heavy heel of a hindsight hierarchism superimposed over the traditional and regular lawmakers of our country.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you something about this man and his family. He was born on a farm and was one of a third generation of farmers, of which none lived more than 10 miles from the largest city of my district. In 1923 he married and rented a farm of 90 acres, which had a small acreage of woodland and pasture. From his boyhood days, he had helped slaughter cattle and pigs raised on their farm. This experience afforded him means to supplement meager earnings on the small farm where he, together with his good wife, began their family life. Five years later they moved to a new rented farm of twice the acreage. While on this second farm, he learned it was profitable to both buy and raise cattle to fatten and slaughter the suitable ones in the winter months. He also built up a meat route among his neighbors and friends in the nearby city and towns. His business grew and he moved to the third farm to increase crops, pasture and herds. He was then in position to buy a carload of cattle from the great arid plains of our western country, and also bring truckloads at times from the neighboring State of West Virginia.

He relates to me that he could put from 300 to 400 pounds of weight on each of these cattle by turning them into the rich pasture of Ohio lands and by further supplementing this pasturage with grain and ensilage in the autumn of the year.

On this larger farm he built himself a small storeroom on the main highway where he sold his meat in the winter season. In 1940 an opportunity came to him to rent a farm of 700 acres. The indomitable spirit of this man accepted hard, clean, honorable work as a challenge.

His family was growing and he had high aspirations for them. This new farm had facilities which broadened and straightened the highway to his conception of life's objectives. I quote from a letter to the Director of Food Distribution, of November 18, 1943:

It was my intention in moving on this Mason farm, to use my previous experience in conducting, with my son and a neighbor, a unified farming operation. I had accumulated some farming machinery and I acquired a sufficient amount of additional ma-

chinery to operate this farm successfully. The lease gave us limited possession of the Mason farm in the fall of 1940. I hired a man to look after the buildings from the fall of 1940 until the spring of 1941 when I moved from the smaller farm to the Mason farm. There was a building on the Mason farm admirably suited by proper improvement, to the slaughtering operation. This building was about 100 feet long and 20 feet wide, with an exterior of tile and concrete. It needed a concrete floor. During the summer of 1941 whenever time could be spent in doing so, my son and I, with the aid of a neighbor boy, worked in adapting this building to the meat business. We mixed the concrete necessary to make a concrete floor in the building; we hired a plumber and brought a pipe from a spring so there would be fresh water on the floor of the slaughter house; we built drains from the floor to a septic tank to take the offal; we built an overhead track in the building; and installed the necessary equipment for conducting a meat business during the winter months. Such an operation is known locally as frost butchering. We also equipped a small storeroom from which the meat could be sold.

After entering into this lease and performing the hard work necessary to do what he considered his part during the days and years of this Nation's severe trials, the heavy hand of our inner super-government fell upon him.

Let us see what his outlook was in going to this larger farm. I quote his words—page 4 of said letter:

With a well-balanced herd on this farm, which would not overtax the resources of the extensive, well-watered pasturage which exists on this farm, and which would be fed a reasonable amount of grain, I feel that I could make a real contribution in my limited way, to the food problem of this country. I could cause to be used up the natural growth in the pasture, which, unless fed up, would simply rot down unused, and that this operation would add something of real economic value to the agricultural resources of this country.

Here is a man who asks nothing more than space, which he was willing to pay and had paid for, the right to manage his own business, the privilege of hard work and the help from the God of his faith, together with fair and reasonable treatment under the law of his country, suffering the stigma of having committed a criminal act in the simple performance of what he considered his patriotic duty.

He recites the conditions which had existed on this large farm before he moved there. Let me further quote from his letter, pages 4 and 5:

In passing, I might say that before I moved on this large farm, an overseer and four or five laborers were operating it; they were using largely commercial fertilizers and farming it for the grain which they could get. The number of cattle maintained was small and their operation proved to be a failure. They were unable to pay to the owners even the amount of rent money. Many of the fields had been so exhausted through inadequate use of manure that I had to build some of them up. A large herd supplies a large amount of manure to be used on these fields and the fertility of those fields has improved as a result of the operation which I have carried on and which, with proper extension of my activities, I could perform to build up this land still further in fertility.

LXXXIX—633

He had worked hard for 2 years building successfully for himself, his family, his community, and his Nation. After 2 years, where does he find himself? I quote from pages 5 and 6 from the aforementioned letter:

On or about the first of March 1943 an investigator from the Office of Price Administration called at my farm and asked me whether I had kept records of the number of cattle and hogs I had butchered in the years 1941, 1942, and up to March 1, 1943. I told him I had not kept specific data as to the number of pounds of each and the number of head of each which I had slaughtered. I gave him, however, my best recollection of the number of such animals killed, and such data was in manner and form as set forth in my application for a permit. My method of keeping books is somewhat simple. I operate on a cash basis. The money I receive I deposit in the bank and make practically all payments by check. I have made out my income-tax reports by going to my banker at Canal Fulton, Ohio, and he has taken my check books and bank books and from those, has ascertained the gross amount of my operations both in grain, butchering, and other farm operations. I have made my tax returns on that basis. Therefore, I was unable to give the statistical data requested by the investigator. He told me that a meat order had been made and that I could not slaughter nor sell meat in excess of what I had slaughtered and sold in the base year 1941. I told him I had never heard of this regulation; that I tried to keep in touch with anything which might affect my business or my farm.

On or about the 6th or 8th of March 1943, papers were served upon me stating that an injunction proceeding had been brought by the Office of Price Administration in the District Court of the United States, entitled "Case No. 21,689, for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division," to restrain me from slaughtering or selling meat in excess of the quantities allowed by regulation. From the date of the service of those papers upon me I stopped slaughtering operations and have not slaughtered any cattle, hogs, or other livestock from that date excepting for the use of my own family. My operations in this regard are at a total standstill until I am authorized through proper governmental authority to engage in such operations. The hearing on the application for temporary injunction was held before the District Court in Cleveland, Ohio, on the 11th day of March 1943. At that time I appeared in Cleveland with my attorney, and he stated that I had not willfully disobeyed any regulation; that as the regulations stood, it indicated that until a permit was granted, there was a probability of a technical violation if I continued commercial slaughtering. He stated some of the facts which are set forth in this petition; he added that I had been a law-abiding citizen and had never been in any legal difficulty before; and requested of the judge that if a temporary injunction issue, under the circumstances that the order state that I had not willfully disobeyed any regulation of the United States Government. Judge Freed stated that all were supposed to know of the existence and application of these regulations and that a temporary injunction must issue.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. I would suggest that perhaps the judge was too dumb to actually know what was going on or else he would not have made such a statement.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Was not the judge just stating the application of the law?

Mr. ROWE. That may be possible.

Mr. LEMKE. It is not the law that an order or a directive that is made contrary to law, without authority of law, and in violation of both law and the Constitution, is not law?

Mr. ROWE. I would assume that is correct.

Quoting this gentleman further:

He was willing, however, that such order state that I had not willfully violated the law. The matter was then taken up later with the attorneys for the Office of Price Administration. The circumstances concerning my case were presented by the attorney for the Office of Price Administration, in Cleveland, to the court, and on the 8th day of May 1943 a decree of dismissal was entered in the United States district court by Judge Freed, which recited that at the time of the filing of the motion for temporary injunction I had engaged in the business of slaughtering livestock in excess of the total amounts thereof permitted under the terms of restriction order No. 1 of the Office of Price Administration; that on the 1st day of April 1943 restriction order No. 1 expired and there was duly issued food distribution order No. 27. The court further found that I had at no time willfully or intentionally violated any of the provisions of said restriction order No. 1; that since the date of the issuance of the preliminary injunction in that action I had wholly ceased from slaughtering any livestock and delivering any meat derived therefrom and that there no longer existed any need for the continuance of said preliminary injunction. The court order further stated that I should hereafter be entitled to engage in business in accordance with the authority and upon the terms and conditions created by or set forth in said food distribution order No. 27, and for these reasons the court found that the preliminary injunction against me was to be dissolved and I was to be permitted to apply to either the Food Distribution Administration or the Department of Agriculture for the issuance of permit and quota applicable to the business of slaughtering animals or livestock in which I might wish hereafter to engage.

In the latter part of May 1943, shortly after the dismissal of the injunction case, I tried, and have tried continuously since that date, to procure a permit. I have been unsuccessful in procuring it. The war meat committee of this county understands my situation and has been willing to grant me a permit, but they say they are limited in authority and that they cannot possibly go beyond the amount of meat which I butchered and sold in the year 1941. No permit has formally been issued although the notice of November 2, 1943, indicates that my permit has been recommended for cancellation. I am confident, however, by reason of the declarations of the members of the war meat committee and of the representatives of the War Food Administration from Columbus and Chicago, who attended the meeting with the county war meat committee, that no relief whatsoever can be expected by me beyond a quota which I might be able to establish in 1941. The representatives from Columbus and Chicago further stated that I would be obliged to present satisfactory evidence of the amount of cattle which was slaughtered in the year 1941. I told them I had not kept such figures; that I knew within a few head the

number of cattle and hogs killed; that my son, who worked with me, knew the number of cattle and hogs butchered in that period, and that both of us would make affidavit to that fact. I stated, however, that my operation did not afford the keeping of a bookkeeper nor of statistical data and that in 1941 I knew of no necessity for keeping such information.

The true character of this man is exemplified in his unwillingness to misstate the truth as he knew it in the face of this crushing edict. The balance of his petition better speaks of this fine character and I quote him:

I confidently believe that there is a real need for grazing and feeding operations such as I conduct on this farm. Ohio has hundreds of farms which have pasturage which is good all through the summer. There are times when other grazing lands become arid and cattle is shipped into the stockyards in a somewhat lean condition. Stockyards have no place to fatten this cattle, there is no well-watered pasturage such as we have, and no ensilage; if any attempt were made to fatten up cattle after arrival from rail transit from some far distant place, the only resource would be to feed them grain, which is a waste of valuable food products which can be used otherwise. In our operation, we can use much less grain in fattening cattle. Instead of having lean cattle slaughtered and put on the market, cattle which has fed on grass, ensilage and a limited amount of grain can be butchered and put on the market, of food value higher than meat from cattle which has been simply grass fed.

I am limited on my farm as to the number of cattle I can raise and feed for my operation, by the amount of pasturage and the amount of grain I can spare; and I cannot sell in my retail trade excepting to those who furnish the proper ration stamps. This of itself would limit my output.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Along the line that the gentleman is suggesting, I have a letter written on November 23 by one of the largest stock handlers in the Chicago area of feeder cattle as well as beef cattle, and I want to quote a paragraph or two, as follows:

The bottleneck in the food industry now is the lack of reliable skilled slaughterers. Just today one of the smaller outfits told me that on Monday they bought 400 head of good fat cattle, expecting to kill 100 head of them that afternoon. They had everything all ready, steam up and floors all ready to start killing operations, but their help failed to function. Too many absentees, and some that did show up were in no condition for work, and the result was they were only able to kill 12 head of cattle when they should have killed the 100 head, as planned. The unions are the greatest bottleneck in the packing industry that we have at this writing.

After the first of the year, it is our guess finished cattle will be a rarity. That is what the administration crowd seems to want. Furthermore, under the present point ruling, it is impossible for families to get good meat any more, as it takes too many ration points to get a pound of good meat, where there is a small family, and small families seem to be the general rule nowadays.

I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that before my committee this learned

Dr. Gilbert, head of the price-fixing system up in the O. P. A., said to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] upon being asked his qualifications for the job, that he knew nothing of business, nothing of the livestock business, that he was an economist, a trained economist, and my friends say a good economist. I think we have the answer there in the Harvard hotshots.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman. I want to quote the writer of this letter further:

It might be asked, Why do I not sell the cattle which I raise and fatten on my farm, to the stockyards at Cleveland? There are several answers to this. (1) All of my skill and experience which I have acquired in over 20 years in butchering and preparing meat products for market would be lost; (2) The stockyard gets the profit of my work, and instead of employing my time during the winter months when the farm work is at the minimum, I must lose that employment and my farming operation might be a financial loss instead of a profit. (3) It is not always that a market is open for cattle such as I raise. For instance, this fall I was called up by a purchaser of cattle in Cleveland and he wanted to know if I did not want to buy a carload of cattle which had come in by rail. He said that the stockyards had experienced a shortage of manpower, that many of their employees had gone into war industries where they were earning a great deal more money than they could be paid in the stockyards operation, and that the stockyards had had more cattle offered to them than they could use. I told him I could not buy the cattle because I had no permit to slaughter. Under such conditions, if I had cattle to sell and wanted to let someone else make the profit on my work, where would I sell such cattle?

Realizing the importance of this situation not only to myself but also to others who conduct like farming operations. I want to give a more specific picture of my own farming operations. I have on my farm 115 head of cattle and 180 head of hogs, over one-half of which have been raised on my farm, the rest having been purchased for fattening on the farm. Of the cattle, 40 are milk cows. From my operations this year, I have in my bins, 10,000 bushels of corn, 2,000 bushels of wheat, a silo 14 by 32 is filled. I have approximately 100 tons of baled hay. I was not so successful with my crop of oats, for a storm destroyed some of it. However, it is hauled in the barn and is still in bundles awaiting threshing. I had 48 acres of oats out. I will get only a fair yield of oats. I have over \$10,000 invested in farm equipment, the principal items of which are as follows: 3 tractors; a large model D tractor, a medium-sized model G tractor, and a smaller model A, which, however, is not the smallest size tractor; 1 combine; 1 pick-up hay baler; 1 2-row corn picker; 1 10-foot power take-off binder; 1 16-row grain drill; 2 3-bottom plows; 1 2-bottom plow; 1 power manure loader; 1 New Ideal manure spreader; 1 silo filler; 1 power hay mower; 1 corn elevator; 1 power feed grinder; 1 milking machine; 1 power corn driller; 2 motortrucks; full blacksmithing equipment; 1 full slaughterhouse equipment; disks, harrows, and other complete farm equipment not herein specified. My son 18 years old is my right-hand man. With his help and that of a neighbor boy and with the labor-saving equipment which I have accumulated, we operate this farm. My other children are: a daughter 16 years of age; twins, a son and daughter aged 12 years; and a daughter, aged

3 years. Each child has some duties on the farm; they are interested in what I am doing and I am trying to show them that there is a place for young people on a farm. I would not want them to feel that their father had transgressed any of the laws of the country. I am grateful to the judge and the attorney for the Office of Price Administration who saw to it that a record was not made which would throw discredit upon my name.

Mr. RAMEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I concur with the gentlemen on the majority side that the judge should not be blamed. He followed the so-called law. On this particular Thanksgiving Day, I am grateful that in the Ninth District of Ohio, under the Administrator O. D. Wearley, who has just retired, an inspector of that kind would not be allowed. The inspectors in that district of Ohio would not slap soldiers in the face by participating in a Gestapo action of that kind. They know our boys are fighting and fighting for a free world. When those boys come back that inspector will not dare show his face and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RAMEY. I want to concur with the majority side in the statement that the judge is not to blame because he has to interpret the so-called law, but I am grateful today that most of these inspectors in the Lake Erie section of Ohio are not like that one.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman.

I do not want to have my children feel that a normal and proper farm operation is unlawful or is frowned upon by our Government. I have been offered work if I would leave my farm and seek employment elsewhere. I feel I can do more good for the country in the work in which I am engaged than I could in a factory. I would like to have my sons become farmers. I need to show them that a farming operation will enable a man to maintain his home, raise his family, and keep out of debt. So far I have been able to do this. I feel that on the farm where I am now situated I could raise a herd large enough to keep up my milk cattle and raise and feed steers for slaughtering and also feed a sufficient number of swine to enable me out of the cattle and hogs so raised and fed to kill at least 50 cattle per month for 6 months in the year and 120 hogs per month for a like period of 6 months. I am respectfully asking for a quota which would permit at least 300 head of cattle and 720 hogs per year to be slaughtered on my farm.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to again quote the preamble to the order which has blotted out the light of hope in this man's life:

And to assure an adequate supply and efficient distribution of beef, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton to meet war and essential civilian needs.

Is there any doubt in your minds why our people are losing faith in the present authority here in Washington?

We read of the distress among the cattle raisers, of high prices as a need for subsidies on meats, of scare statements by people in prominent places, and we have heard a colleague recite about his constituents having to take back to the farms hundreds of head of hogs because

there was no room to store the meat after butchering.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I should like to throw a little light on that, if I can. I have in my district a slaughterhouse that is listed by the War Labor Board as a national slaughterer. It so happens that since January 1, 1941, the wages in that slaughterhouse have arisen 21 percent, or 6 percent over the Little Steel formula, yet they cannot get skilled slaughterhouse employees. Because of that bottleneck my constituents haul their cattle to market and then haul them back again. So I am sure that we are going to have to look further than just labor in these slaughterhouses for the solution of a problem that is crying for action right now.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Here is an instance where the man asks nothing except help from his God to proceed to raise his grain and fatten his cattle and to deliver and distribute the meat as this preamble to the order has described.

There comes along an investigator, not to say that he shall suspend, not that he shall cut down the quota, but that he shall cease and desist.

With conditions like this all over our land, and the sluggish action of the O. P. A. with the point system, the people are without meat as a glut prevails to further excuse the restrictive orders of the philosophy of scarcity.

Here is an agency stopping a real American from providing us with much good meat, while the First Lady of our land is quoted in the papers of my home town as saying:

I lived through the last war and the cost of living doubled. It happened once and it can happen again. Look at China today, and remember Germany after the last war. Once inflation starts, money depreciates in value until it buys less and less.

If prices are doubled, then pork chops will cost 76 cents a pound, instead of 38 cents.

Think of it, to make a statement like that when hogs are being returned to the farms because there is no place to store the meat.

Our people are troubled by a terrible war which we believe is not our fault or of our making. They are vexed at a sort of tyranny here at Washington which we do know is our fault. It is within the power of this Congress to give them relief, and the wind of inaction will bring the whirlwind of accounting.

The words of Confucius are an admonition on this day and now:

The people are the root of a country; the root firm, the country is tranquil. What the people want, Heaven will be found to give effect to.

Mr. Speaker, there are good signs among us in these troubled days. Congress is taking its full authority unto itself. I recognize the tendency to set determined courses for a return to constitutional government and by the people's representatives. This march must

be kept up and the tempo increased so that real Americans such as the man about whom I have spoken today shall not suffer a loss of morale, lest by the breaking of their spirit our kind of government shall fail and fall. This charge is ours. These orders which slowly but surely stifle and put out the lights of individual liberty and freedom are the heralding of a ringing challenge to our capacity to represent our people and keep their Government from passing out of their hands.

Listen, as silent chambers speak to us. Washington said:

Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if they exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if they desolate and lay waste our fields, still under new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It would be but a trifle even if the walls of yonder capital were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished governments?

Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty of State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitter tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

APPOINTMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE ARMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for present consideration the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SHORT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I wish the chairman would take a minute or two to explain to the Members of the House the import of this particular measure.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under the National Defense Act brigadier generals can be commissioned from the line in the Army of the United States as permanent officers only when they have had 28 or more years of continuous commissioned service in the Regular Establishment. During the present war the President has sent to the Senate of the United States just recently a recommendation for the appointment and commissioning of five different officers of the rank of lieutenant colonel or above as lieutenant generals in the line. These officers have not had the 28 years of continuous service required by the National Defense Act.

For the information of the House, I may say that it applies to only five officers, four of whom have distinguished

themselves on duty in combat areas on the war fronts in Europe and Asia. It particularly applies to Gen. Mark Clark, commander of the Fifth Army in Italy; General Kenney, the chief of the Fifth Air Force in the southwest Pacific; two other generals whose names I do not now recall; and one in the War Department. The only purpose of this measure is to enable those men to be commissioned as brigadier generals even though they have not had the 28 years of continuous service.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Does that apply only to brigadier generals or does it also apply to major generals?

Mr. MAY. Officers below the rank of lieutenant colonel cannot be commissioned as brigadier generals. The appointments must be of officers holding that rank or higher.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. But this does not apply to major generals?

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. This does not open the door to the promotion of men without that length of service to the post of major general?

Mr. MAY. No.

I would say further that the House committee struck out all of the bill which the Senate passed and wrote a new provision which limits the promotions to 25 percent of those available under existing law. The idea we had in mind was that there will be others who will have opportunities like Gen. Mark Clark and General Kenney and others to demonstrate their great ability as generals, and we will want to leave some place for them. Therefore we confined it to 25 percent of those authorized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it or is it not true—and I believe it to be true—that General Pershing was promoted from a captaincy to a brigadier generalcy in order that we might have the benefit of the experience he had in the Philippines and other combat areas, for the purposes of the last war?

Mr. MAY. I understand that to be correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the person have to have 28 years of continuous service now regardless of what rank he holds before he is promoted?

Mr. MAY. That is right, before he can be commissioned as a brigadier general, and he must have a rank not below that of lieutenant colonel.

Mr. HINSHAW. When was that 28-year provision placed in the law?

Mr. MAY. In 1920, I believe.

Mr. HINSHAW. It seems to me that the world would have lost the services of a number of great officers who served as commanding generals at the age of 30 and 35 if that law had been in existence before.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from California is absolutely correct. It is for

this very reason that we have brought in this proposed legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can see no sense in the 28-year limitation when what you want is good officers.

Mr. SHORT. We can take officers of the line who are lieutenant colonels and above, and can make them brigadier generals, regardless of whether or not they have had 28 years of service, under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I personally would like to take them with a lot less than 28 years' service, so that we could get some really capable men.

Mr. MAY. Some of them have had considerably less than 28 years of service, and because of their demonstrated ability we put this provision in the bill.

Mr. SHORT. May I explain to the Members of the House that several of the Members of our committee would like to have added to this bill an amendment providing that generals on reaching the age of 64, if they are physically and mentally fit, of sound body and mind, should be continued in the service and not retired, particularly for the duration of the war.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can understand that, but the thing that interests me is the fact that a good many of our officers, very capable officers, have had to serve for as long as 17 to 20 years as first lieutenants before they could be promoted to captains. If there is anything that is stultifying to the mind of an Army officer, it is to have to serve that long in a low grade such as I have mentioned.

Mr. SHORT. It is to cure that very defect that we have brought in this measure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was going to bring up the very point the gentleman brought up. What is now the War Department's policy on the retirement of officers when they have reached the age limit of 64?

Mr. SHORT. The War Department up until the present time has been rather strong in its conviction they are automatically retired. Now, whether they are going to continue to do that or not, I cannot prophesy, but I want to do a little horse trading on this bill. I want them to yield as well as to take.

Mr. MAY. Let me explain that under the law it is mandatory that when colonels reach the age of 60 they must be retired; brigadier generals must be retired at the age of 62 and major generals at the age of 64. And if there is anybody at fault it is the Congress itself. There is a bill pending in the Military Affairs Committee of the House on which I expect to have some hearings rather early in order to ascertain the reason why they are discharging all of these good officers and not using them for other purposes in the armed forces.

Mr. SHORT. I think it is silly to say the least, and it is a great waste of manpower.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I ask this further question? I do not oppose this bill, I think it is the thing to do. But you are releasing the age limit at one end and then at the other end you have very many capable officers, and there is not a man on this floor that has not received some letters from his district, say, regarding one particular officer that we all know is capable. You are releasing them at one end and it seems to me logical the committee ought to release them on the other end. There are not many officers and after all age is not the criterion. The purpose of this law in its origin was to keep the ranks moving in the Army in peacetime so we would not be cluttered up with a lot of people at the other end.

Mr. MAY. We passed the promotion statute and made it mandatory in order to get this hump out of the Army, as we call it, where they had a vast excess of officers following the last war. Under the laws that exist, they can appoint probably 60 officers under the section of the National Defense Act, and we restrict these appointments to 25 percent of that number.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How many generals do we have in the Army now, may I ask the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. MAY. You mean brigadier generals on up?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Brigadier generals on up.

Mr. MAY. I do not have any idea.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it true we have more lieutenant generals in this war than in all the other wars combined?

Mr. MAY. I do not know about that. I would not be surprised if we would not need a staff of them before we get through.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, yes; we have had infinitely more.

Mr. KNUTSON. In other wars?

Mr. SHORT. In this war, than in all other wars combined. Soon we will have as many lieutenant generals as we have privates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 381), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. That hereafter brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army shall be appointed from among officers of the line permanently commissioned in the Regular Army and carried on the promotion list in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel whose names are borne on an eligible list prepared annually by a board of not less than five general officers of the line, not below the grade of major general; and hereafter appointment as chief of any branch shall be made from among officers permanently commissioned in the Regular Army in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel and who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in such branch or on similar duty that they are qualified for such appointment."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all of section 4 and insert:

"Sec. 4. That hereafter brigadier generals of the line shall be appointed from among officers of the line commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel who are credited with 28 years' continuous commissioned service in the Regular Army as hereinbefore provided and whose names are borne on an eligible list prepared annually by a board of not less than five general officers of the line, not below the grade of major general: *Provided, however,* That not more than 25 percent of the total authorized number of brigadier generals of the line may be appointed, without regard to length of service, from among officers of the line commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel and whose names are borne on such eligible list. Hereafter appointment as chief of any branch shall be made from among officers commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel who are credited with 28 years' continuous commissioned service in the Regular Army as hereinbefore provided, and who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in such branch or on similar duty that they are qualified for such appointment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein several quotations from official documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, delay in fixing the policy of this country as to enemy-owned property which is under our control and within the undisputed powers of the Congress to use in aid of the war effort and to lessen the private war losses of American citizens is dangerous.

In the last war with Germany we said this was something to be decided when the war was over. As a result, to this day, 25 years later, the losses of our own citizens have never been fully paid. Because we did not define a policy until it was too late, 80 percent of German enemy property has been returned to its original owners to enrich the German Reich, to enable it to re-form its cartels, to destroy American commerce, and to rebuild the war machinery which is now being used to destroy American lives.

To delay action now is to open the way to an enemy-inspired propaganda campaign to arouse our sympathies for our soon-to-be-vanquished foe, at a time when the war spirit has waned, arouse a false sympathy for them which will lead us into a repetition of the same tragic mistake we made following World War No. 1. Failure to act decisively will hearten the German and Japanese bankers and industrialists, encourage them in the belief that, however the war goes,

they will get back their American investments.

Let us settle it once and for all here and now, that under no circumstances, at any time or in any manner, will they get back a dollar out of their American investments. Let us proclaim to the world that we are going to be as just to our own citizens as good morals and maxims of the law require us to be—to be just before we are generous.

And to make the more certain that there shall be in the acquisition proceedings no taint of confiscation, the conditions imposed upon our defeated enemies in the unconditional-surrender proclamation and in all treaties that may be negotiated later should require the defeated Axis Powers to reimburse their own citizens in their own currency for any losses suffered by reason of American legal action.

The Members of the present Congress should look at the record of German infidelity, ingratitude, and trickery, realizing that we can expect nothing better from Japan—a nation whose foul deeds and treacherous activities have long ago deprived it of any claim to considerate treatment at the hands of any self-respecting, treaty-observing peoples.

If there are any among us who still hesitate to act so drastically in respect to these still powerful and yet undefeated criminal nations, I hope that they will carefully read in the cold type the story of German depravity which is contained in the June 2, 1941, report of the Acting American Agent of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, to the Secretary of State, who, under an agreement between our country and Germany, represented American victims of German ruthlessness in the last war. Consider, please, these paragraphs, excerpts from the preliminary statement:

This report, discussing the activity of the Commission and the American Agency since December 31, 1934, the date of the last previous report by the American agent, covers a period in which some of the most interesting and important work was accomplished.

During this period, all of the pending claims before the Commission were disposed of and, in accordance with the provisions of the notes exchanged between the two Governments on May 7, 1934, no other matters were to be dealt with by the Commission.

The claims thus disposed of were the claim of Katherine McNider Drier (Docket Nos. 4712 and 11485), that was dismissed by the Commission on October 30, 1939, and the well-known sabotage claims arising out of the destruction by German saboteurs, of the Black Tom terminal in New York Harbor in July 1916, and the ammunition assembling plant at Kingsland, N. J., in January 1917. Awards in the sabotage claims were entered by the Commission on October 30, 1939.

A concise account is given below of the stages of the litigation in the sabotage claims subsequent to December 31, 1934. Briefly, the final decision of the Commission not only found that the Hamburg decision of 1930 in favor of Germany had been obtained largely through the introduction on the part of Germany of false and fraudulent evidence but also found that Germany, on the basis of an exhaustive study of the entire record, was responsible for the destruction of the properties in question. It is believed that this is the first occasion on which a decision has

been rendered by an international tribunal against a government, party to the arbitration, based on such findings.

The spectacular character of the proceedings was maintained to the end. In the final stages the German Commissioner on March 1, 1939, retired from the Commission in an obvious effort to render it incapable of handing down a decision adverse to Germany. The withdrawal of the German Commissioner took place after submission of briefs and exhaustive arguments and at a time when the three members of the Commission were engaged in a discussion of all questions, including the matter of false, perjured, and collusive evidence relating to the responsibility of Germany, except merely the question of the extent of the damages suffered by the American nationals involved. The Commission continued its deliberations in the absence of the German Commissioner, and arrived at its decision without consideration of any evidence except that which constituted part of the record at the time of the withdrawal of the German Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, the base character of the enemy we have to deal with could not be revealed more clearly than it was in the crafty maneuvers the German Commissioner indulged in in the futile effort to prevent the issuance of awards to aggrieved American citizens.

Think of it! The German Commissioner voluntarily retires and then, calling attention to his own absence, insisted that for that reason alone the Commission was incompetent—that is, without jurisdiction to proceed with its business. But let us have it in the words of the report itself:

At meetings held on June 15 and October 30, 1939, after due notice to Germany, the commission finally disposed of the sabotage claims. Awards totaling over \$21,100,000, exclusive of interest, were entered October 30, 1939, in these claims. These awards carry interest from various dates to date of payment. On October 31, 1939, the awards were duly certified by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment. Prior to such certification, protests had been filed with the Secretary of State by the German Government and with the American commissioner by the German commission which in effect urged the incompetency of the Commission to function following the voluntary retirement of the German commissioner. The protests also indulged in a number of intemperate accusations against the umpire of the Commission.

Let it be said, Mr. Speaker, to the eternal credit of our then Secretary of State that he did not hesitate to rebuke the German Government for its shoddy attempts to frustrate the Commission or to quickly resent its cheap, intemperate accusations against the Commission's umpire. Under date of October 18, 1939, the Secretary wrote the German Chargé d'Affaires ad interim—decisions and opinions of June and October 1939, appendix, page xxx—as follows:

I have entire confidence in the ability and integrity of the umpire and the commissioner appointed by the United States despite your severe and, I believe, entirely unwarranted criticisms, and I am constrained to invite your attention to the fact that the remarkable action of the commissioner appointed by Germany was apparently designed to frustrate or postpone indefinitely the work of the Commission at a time when, after years of labor on the particular cases involved, it was expected that its functions would be brought to a conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, do facts such as these warrant sympathy? It will take more than the tears of our professional sobbing sisters and our ever blubbering brothers to blot out this sordid record. Let us have action, and have it now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter which I received and a copy of some other resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an item from last Sunday's Washington Star, in which Mr. Chester Bowles amplifies his inflation remarks at press conference and also an article entitled "The Spread of Russian Influence in Post-war Europe," by Constantine Brown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial of the Waukegan News-Sun of last Friday, November 19, in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes relative to a telegram received from Admiral Nimitz.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I was supplied this morning with a copy of a message that Admiral Nimitz, commanding our naval forces in the Pacific, had sent to the widow of our beloved colleague, Hon. J. William Ditter. The message reads:

The officers and men of the Pacific Fleet join me in deepest sympathy to you in your great loss. We hope that you will receive consolation in the knowledge that your husband contributed in a large measure to the construction of our magnificent fleet and that he lost his life in the service of his country.

And is signed "C. W. Nimitz, Admiral, United States Navy."

That is another grand and well-deserved tribute to our distinguished late colleague and friend, and I am particularly happy that Admiral Nimitz, who stands in the forefront of our naval leadership today, himself a truly great man, saw fit to acknowledge in this way the Navy's appreciation of Bill Ditter's large part in providing us with the formidable establishment we now have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

A QUESTION PERIOD ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE FOR HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to talk about a matter in which most of us are interested. That is, a system by which many of us think the method of communication between Members of the House and heads of the executive departments can be improved; a method by which we can have an accounting from the heads of the departments as to how they are administering and interpreting the laws that we pass; a method that will bring about better team work between the Congress and the executive departments.

I have been granted 45 minutes, and during the discussion I will be glad to yield at any time to have the observations or comments of any Member who desires to make them.

The plan set forth in House Resolution 327 is a variation of an old idea. It is simple and can be put into effect by a mere change in the rules of the House. The resolution provides for a question period at least once in every 2 weeks, but not oftener than once a week. The period is limited to 2 hours. One half of the time is to be allotted to answering written questions which have been previously submitted by the committee issuing the invitation and having jurisdiction of the subject matter. The remaining half of the time is to be consumed by questions from the floor. Control of the time for asking the questions is to be divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee which issued the invitation. The Rules Committee will fix the priority of appearances and the length of time for each period. Only one executive would appear during one period.

I am thoroughly convinced that a frank, open consultation between the independent agencies, which, of course, includes Cabinet members, and the Members of Congress would be beneficial to Congress, to the Executive, and in the interest of better Government.

I wish you would think of the men in the Government today who are best able to counsel us as to whether this or a similar procedure would be of value. If I should ask you which two men in the Government are best able to advise us of the merits or demerits of this proposal, I believe that most Members would agree those two men are Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren. I believe that most of us would select Secretary Hull as eminently competent to advise us, because he has served long and ably in the House and in the Senate. Since 1933 he has been in the executive part of the Government as the first member of the Cabinet. Congress has always been close to his heart. His deep knowledge of Government and the high regard in which he is held by Members of Congress and by the people throughout the Nation give great weight and value to his opinion.

Mr. Hull appeared here before a joint session of the House and Senate. Had he thought his appearance would be in vio-

lation of the spirit of our Constitution, or of our tradition, he would not have accepted our invitation. Mr. Hull thought his appearance would be in the public interest, as indeed it was, otherwise, he would not have come before us.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I am very much interested in the proposal the gentleman from Tennessee has made here, and I compliment him highly in presenting this method of communication and association between the Congress and the executive branches of the Government.

Is it not a fact that the appearance of Secretary Hull before the joint session of the Congress a few days ago was the first time in the history of this Congress that a member of the Cabinet or head of an executive department, other than the President, came before this body?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Arkansas, as far as I know, the appearance of Mr. Hull was the first time a member of the Cabinet has appeared here before a session of Congress, since the First Congress. It occurred several times in the First Congress. I may be mistaken about it, but I have not found any instance in history where it occurred since the First Congress, except in the appearance of Mr. Hull.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I think every Member of Congress will agree that the appearance of Secretary Hull before the Congress was certainly appreciated, and certainly was a move toward unanimity and better cooperation. Does the gentleman's proposal provide that the question and answer method is mandatory?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In answer to the gentleman from Arkansas, the resolution provides that they are invited to appear, and that only those who indicate a willingness to come will be invited.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. My thought was that in case some member of an executive department wanted to come up here and discuss a certain matter with Congress, the Congress would have to listen to him discuss that matter. Under the proposal made here, would that be permissible or would it be mandatory with us by the question and answer session?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Our procedure would operate in this way: Suppose Mr. Morgenthau or the Secretary of the Treasury, whoever he might be, was willing to discuss some tax problem and the Ways and Means Committee wished for him to do so. The Ways and Means Committee would issue an invitation and would prepare the questions which would direct the course of the discussion in the way that they desired. They could do that by their questions. Then he would be invited to appear and the time would be set by the Rules Committee. The first part of the time allotted would be in answer to the questions previously submitted to him. I take it that in answer to those, if it were pertinent to the

matter under inquiry, he could address us and talk at length about the subject upon which we wanted information. Then the latter part of the period would be available for questions propounded from the floor of the House, with the control of the time for questions in the hands of the chairman and ranking minority members of the committee.

I thank the gentleman for bringing out those points.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am very much interested in the gentleman's proposal and believe it might work to the benefit of the entire country, through providing Congress with a means of obtaining certain information. It seems to me, however, that in considering the proposition for questions and answers to be made out by the committee, it will be merely duplicating that same thing which they already do in the committee. They are entitled to invite the Secretary of this department or that department or the administrator of some agency before the committee at any time and question him in the committee. It seems to me that the purpose of a meeting with the head of a particular department would be to enable Congress, outside of the committee, to learn more about what is going on. Therefore, I think I should have to object to the provision that the committee itself would make up the questions. I think that those questions ought to come from the Members outside of the committee, certainly as much as from members of the committee itself. I ask the gentleman what he thinks about that proposition.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Of course, I want to say that the resolution I have prepared is rudimentary. It is only intended as something to open discussion on the subject. There are two problems to deal with.

In the first place you have got to have an orderly procedure to prevent embarrassment or heckling or the discussion from getting off on irrelevant subjects; and in the second place we want to have it as free and open as possible so every Member can ask a question if it is a proper one.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows the British system of handling that matter: The question is placed on the floor a week earlier and the member of the Cabinet is given an opportunity, I believe through his secretary if he chooses, to answer in a written statement, and any Member of Parliament may ask the head of the Department a question. The question may be as embarrassing as anyone likes; as a matter of fact, I believe they encourage the minority to ask embarrassing questions. I know that the gentleman may have difficulty in placing himself in his mind in the position of being a minority Member, but that might happen some day and I know that at that time he would enjoy asking a new administration some embarrassing questions just as the mi-

nority Members today would enjoy asking such questions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the gentleman from California that I am thoroughly familiar with the British system but I think the procedure I have suggested would work better under our system than the British technique, because under the British system the ministers are creatures of the House of Commons; under our system they are not. Under our plan we expect to bring them here for particular purposes and at particular times. I believe a system can be worked out whereby a Member would have an opportunity of getting his question presented. In the first place he could talk to members of the committee about it and see if he could not get some member of the committee to include it; in the second place it is contemplated that a copy be sent to the Rules Committee and he would have a double shot at it in the Rules Committee.

In the third place half of the period is allowed for questions from the floor, and I think the chairmen and the ranking minority members of most committees are very liberal in giving any Member a right to speak. They certainly would be liberal in giving anybody a right to ask a question, particularly if it were a question intended to bring out something of importance. The technique of it, I may say to the gentleman from California, is something we shall have to work out. I have no particular set notions about it; at least I want some procedure inaugurated.

Mr. HINSHAW. I greatly appreciate the gentleman's idea; I think it is a good one. I am not criticizing the gentleman in any way, but on the contrary complimenting him in the highest possible terms.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. At the same time I know the gentleman does not want to preclude a minority Member from asking questions, yet I am afraid that if it filters through a committee the minority will be precluded from asking such questions as the minority may think embarrassing but on the other hand may turn out just the opposite.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It certainly was not my intention to deny the minority any prerogatives. I think it would work out so both sides would be on an equal footing. Certainly it was not my intention to put either side at a disadvantage. Also I did not mean to infer that embarrassing questions should not be asked so long as they are intended to bring out information. I meant that an executive should be protected from questions which were asked solely for the purpose of embarrassing him personally.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure the gentleman is eminently fair and I am merely making a suggestion which may assist him in the further consideration of the legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. SUMNERS of Texas rose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman on the proposal he is placing before us. I feel that it is a good one even though it is tentative, as has just been explained.

The thought brought out by the gentleman from Arkansas a moment ago as to the appearance of Secretary Hull being the first appearance of a Cabinet member before a joint session of Congress recalls to my mind that in the very beginnings of the Republic the President of the United States, George Washington, appeared before the Senate, feeling that it was his constitutional right to come to them personally to talk over treaty matters. It so happened they did not do it that way in the beginning and a different procedure became encrusted in precedent. I am not so sure but what the earlier procedure would have been better. Our liberal Constitution, brief though it be, permits us within its limitations to do a great many things in a constitutional manner and yet by different ways. I approve of the thing the gentleman is proposing here to bring about a closer relationship between these two great branches of government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the gentleman's observations are a great contribution to this discussion and I believe the incident the gentleman related of the first President's appearing in person before the Senate is definite evidence that our Constitution rather intended that some consultative custom like this be worked out.

There is nothing in the Constitution to prohibit this being done. The branches of the Government are separate but each branch affects the workings of the other branch. It was never intended by our Constitution makers that the divisions of Government should be kept separate in a strict and actual sense. The founding fathers, I think, intended that some procedure like this should be inaugurated. In the law organizing the Treasury Department, passed in 1789, it made it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to "make reports and give information to either branch of the legislature, in person or in writing—as he may be required—respecting all matters which may be referred to him by the Senate or House of Representatives or which shall appertain to his office."

In the debate on that bill it was expressly objected to that it might lead to the introduction of all the Secretaries on the floor but the bill was nevertheless passed and without so much as a denial that such would be the result.

Nor has our history been without illustration of the necessity and of examples of this practice. In the early days of the Government the Secretaries were repeatedly called to the presence of either House for consultation, advice, and information.

Wednesday, July 22, 1789: The Secretary of Foreign Affairs (Mr. Jefferson) attended, agreeably to order, and made the necessary explanations. (Annals Congress, vol. 1, p. 51, 1st Cong.)

Saturday, August 22, 1789: The Senate again entered on executive business. The

President of the United States came into the Senate Chamber, attended by General Knox (Secretary of War), and laid before the Senate the following statement of the facts, with the questions thereto annexed, for their advice and consent. (Annals of Congress, 1st Cong., vol. 1, p. 66.)

And again on the Monday following the President and General Knox were before the Senate.

Friday, August 7, 1789: The following message was received from the President of the United States, by General Knox (the Secretary of War), who delivered therewith sundry statements and papers relating to the same. (Proceedings of House of Representatives, Annals of Congress, vol. 1, p. 684.)

Monday, August 10, 1789: The following message was received from the President by General Knox (Secretary of War), who delivered in the same, together with statement of the troops in the service of the United States. (Proceedings of House of Representatives, Annals of Congress, vol. 1, p. 689.)

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. We have heard the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, so many, many times call here for teamwork between the various departments of our Government. That is what we need now; we need it in peacetime, but doubly so in wartime. I think I see a great gulf between the lawmaking branch of this Government and the administrative department; and I wish that gulf could be bridged to the advantage of our Nation. I believe the gentleman is working in the right direction.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the gentleman that I believe we are approaching the post-war period in a precarious situation with the terrible breach between the executive and the legislative branches. Unless we get some better working arrangements we cannot have a long-range foreign policy.

I am anxious to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the great Committee on the Judiciary, who asked me to yield a few minutes ago.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I understand my colleague, what he is now trying to do is to submit to the judgment of the House the general proposition and to see if he cannot first procure an agreement with reference to the principle and basic policy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. And if that can be done, then he does anticipate that in committees and through whatever other machinery we have in our legislative arrangement, we will then try to work out and develop how this thing is to operate so that both the majority and the minority may have all the rights which are inherent in our system of government and which ought to be exercised by each person who is a Member of the Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman states my aim correctly. I presented this resolution as something to work on,

and I may say to the gentleman I have been thinking about this for a long time.

In January I introduced a bill similar to this resolution. Then I reached the conclusion that the better procedure would be to amend the rules of the House. In October we were invited by General Marshall and Secretary Stimson to hear them in the auditorium at the Congressional Library. When I was over there it occurred to me that the information we were getting was very valuable and interesting but we were like an audience in a picture show. We had no opportunity of directing the discussion along the channels we wanted information about, we could not ask any questions, we did not have any part in the procedure, yet in spite of those limitations it was a very valuable meeting and we were given much useful information. So I decided then it would be very, very much better, if we could have a consultation like that right here in our own forum on the floor of the House under our own rules, where we could guide and direct the discussion and secure the type of information we wanted.

On that very same day I came back to the floor and filed this resolution. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has pointed out, it is merely something to work on, to see if we can get the general idea across. I am sure the Rules Committee, before whom the resolution is pending, will work it out so as to be fair and so as to protect the executive heads from picayune questions and personal embarrassment, and that they will also protect the rights of the minority and the prerogatives of the majority.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the gentleman's proposal, it is to change or amend the rules of the House to permit rather round-table discussions with heads of the executive departments, agencies, and Cabinet officers. Since the Constitution provides that there shall be three independent branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—and since the Congress for many years has been rapidly tending toward uncontrolled bureaucracy, does not the gentleman fear a little bit that if we open the gates to the heads of these departments to make their play before the House of Representatives they might become more powerful than they are now even, when they not only disburse the funds we give them but control the disbursement of them, and that we might get into some little difficulty in that direction?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the gentleman raises that subject. In the first place, while we say we have three separate and distinct divisions of our Government, that is not actually and literally true. They have to work in some degree of cooperation with each other.

The executive power is vested in the President but he is authorized to participate in the lawmaking power so as to give Congress information on the state of the Union; to recommend to the con-

sideration of Congress such measures as he shall judge necessary; to convene both Houses of Congress, or either of them. Also, no resolution or bill to which the concurrence of the Senate and House may be necessary shall take effect without his approval unless passed by two-thirds majority over his disapproval. The Executive has the power of one-sixth of the membership of the House and one-sixth of the membership of the Senate by virtue of his power of veto.

The legislative power was confided to Congress. Congress has great control over the executive and judicial branches. Congress has the power to fix the compensation of all officers of the United States. It has provided who should act as President in the event of disqualification of the President and Vice President. It has power to establish all offices not prescribed in the Constitution. It has power to establish all courts not prescribed by the Constitution—to regulate the salaries, and to define the jurisdiction and powers of the judges. Congress defines all crimes which may be tried by these courts.

The judicial powers are confided to the Supreme Court of the United States, but the executive and legislative branches are not independent of the Supreme Court. The Court has the power to annul any law that Congress passes, or to set aside any order made by the Executive. The Chief Justice presides over the Senate in an impeachment trial of a President.

This shows that the departments of the Government, though separate, are yet in organization and function so entwined and interdependent that they cross the boundaries of each other. It is as Senator Pendleton said:

They come in contact, but not in conflict. They cross the paths assigned to each without meeting or clashing in the pathways.

I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that this system would not make the executive department more powerful. It would make the Congress more powerful. It would enable Congress to deal more effectively with the executive department. We would have better information. We would be able to see what they were doing. The galleries would be filled, the great importance of the Congress would be brought to the attention of the people of the Nation and the Congress would regain its position. Also if the executive heads knew they were to be asked up here to give an accounting they would be a whole lot more careful with the directives and orders they issue. We would have an opportunity face to face to tell them what the people want done and to explain to them the hopes, aspirations, and wishes of the people.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think that the regular standing committees of the House of Representatives as they are now constituted would be more apt to get detailed inside information out of a Cabinet officer or the head of an executive agency in a committee room than you would on the House floor where it is a round-table discussion and there are arguments one way or the other?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the gentleman this is not intended in any way to supplant the work of committees. The difficulty about the committee system in connection with big matters of national and international importance, and that is what we are going to deal with in these sessions, matters involving big governmental policies, is that the particular members of one committee have a hard time attending that committee regularly and all the Members of the House certainly cannot be at the particular meeting where those things are under discussion.

The hearings may not be printed for weeks or months afterward and they are so voluminous nobody can read them. So we would get better information on big matters under consideration if we could have these men up here and have a frank, free, and open discussion with them on the floor of the House.

It would help the committees in bringing about a more complete understanding of the problems and it would result in advising and making the Congress more conscious of the basic facts of the problem under consideration. There is much delay in printing of committee hearings and unless a bill is reported favorably the testimony before the committee may never be printed. Furthermore, as a practical matter, we cannot possibly read all the committee hearings. We glance through the voluminous volumes, pick out some particular item we are especially interested in and that is about all we can do. This plan is not presented in lieu of the work of the committees. It will implement and make the work of the committees easier because it is a means whereby all Members can secure direct information in the shortest possible length of time relative to the big problems that are facing us. The work of the committees would be easier if Members of Congress had more general information on the problems of government. It is said that Congress receives reports from the various departments and agencies. This is true. But how many of us can read all of these voluminous reports. It is humanly impossible to do so. Many of them contain much detail and Members of Congress generally do not, and cannot, study all of the reports sent by the departments. Furthermore, we need to be currently informed. These reports generally only tell us the things the departments want us to know. We need some method of ferreting out other information. We need to do that currently and not have to wait until the end of the year in order to find out what a department head has done.

Mr. DILWEG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DILWEG. I am in full accord with the gentleman's proposal, because I feel very strongly that we can effectively adjust ourselves to the needs of war if the heads of departments and independent agencies appeared before the House. Does not the gentleman believe that, if this procedure is followed, that it would

help eliminate the many special committees that we have appointed in this House?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Undoubtedly that is true. I asked the Library of Congress to give me information during the Seventy-seventh Congress on the number of resolutions for investigations filed during that Congress. The number they reported is 217; the requests for specific information from departments, and so forth, 37; and we have continued 16 special investigating committees. They say that probably they did not get all of them. The 217 requests for investigating committees certainly show that the Congress is in bad need of expert, detailed information. I am sure the necessity for a lot of these committees would be obviated if we could have the administrators up here, find out what they are doing, and get them to tell us about their plans and let them know what we think about it.

Mr. DILWEG. Would it not save the time of responsible departmental heads if we could call them before the House instead of having them appear before various overlapping committees?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would. I checked up on that matter, and I have the record here. In 1 month one administrator appeared seven times before House committees and gave substantially the same testimony at each place. It must have been a great burden on him.

Mr. RAMSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. Following what was stated by the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, prior to which the gentleman said that the members would be restricted so that there would be no what you called picaresque questions asked.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. RAMEY. Is there not grave danger that the Member would be restricted by what some other Member might say is a picaresque question? The department man or the Cabinet member who answers it might be allowed to make a self-serving declaration, rather than answer the question, just as we have Cabinet members appear before the committees. You ask a question; they will not answer it directly, but will circumvent or go around the mulberry bush, and perhaps he makes a speech. His so-called answer is not in reality an answer but just a self-serving declaration to set himself good while the Member is restricted in the question. Could we have it so the answer to a question must be direct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I say to the gentleman that that is the intention. I believe public opinion would require his answer be forthright and direct. If an administrator came here and evaded an issue or did not answer directly, or if he did not know his business, he would be awfully embarrassed before the bar of public opinion. He would not do it again.

Mr. RAMEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it would have a very fine effect on the administrators, and certainly the President would be

even more careful in selecting the Cabinet and the administrative officials if he knew they were to come up here and account to the Members of the House.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. I have the impression that all the members of the British Cabinet are Members of the Parliament. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DISNEY. Then they have the right as well as the duty to be upon the floor. I am wondering if the gentleman senses any danger of an additional merger of the legislative branch of our Government with the executive branch, which is already going on pretty rapidly by this process.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under the British system, ministers are Members of the House of Commons, elected by the House of Commons, and responsible to them. This could not be the entering wedge of a ministerial system for many, many reasons. In the first place, the Constitution sets up the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

In the second place, the continuation of the separation of powers is guaranteed by the constitutional provision that no Member of the Congress shall hold any administrative office in the Government during his continuance in office. Therefore, we cannot under the Constitution have the ministerial system. We already have a kind of consultation between the Congress and the executive branch. We have it in our committees, in our offices, and in the cloakrooms. What we want to do is bring it out in the open, where we can all hear and here on the floor there will be frank discussion.

Some few Members, and I am glad they are few, are disinclined toward this idea because they say it might be said we are aping England. This is not a valid objection, because in the first place, if any nation has a legislative device which would be useful to us, I do not see why we should not make use of it. In the second place, this is a good American plan which is workable under our system and it can be sustained as a part of our American system. It is interesting to know that all nations, which have representative government, have a means of direct consultation such as is proposed here. It might with equal force be said that we would be copying the system of any of these other nations.

I view the floor of the House as a workshop for the people's representatives and a tool that will add to the dignity or enable us to do our job better is worthy of favorable consideration. As a matter of fact, I think most Members who have seen the question hour in practice in the House of Commons in England or in Canada will agree that it has real value to the legislative branch and to the people of those countries. While our systems of governments are different, I think we can and should benefit by their experiences, but it is important to bear

in mind that the suggestion has its origin in the development of our own laws and I think we must discuss it within its capacity of adjustment to our American system.

Mr. DISNEY. Does the gentleman's resolution restrict the appearance on the floor to members of the Cabinet?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The resolution covers the heads of departments and independent agencies, which includes the Cabinet and the independent offices and commissions.

Mr. DISNEY. Of course, in doing this we would want to keep in mind that the departments have more influence on legislation nowadays than the Congress itself, at least according to the Washington newspapers. We would have to be pretty careful.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think we would be in a better position to pass legislation if we had more information. We would be better able to take care of ourselves and to use our independent judgment.

Mr. DISNEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly we would be in a better position to follow up how the laws we pass are being administered.

Mr. DISNEY. I realize our information is limited because we run so many errands we do not have time to keep up with everything.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. We just do not physically have time to read all the hearings.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank my colleague. He, of course, is aware of my own enthusiasm for this proposal. I have been deeply gratified also at the favorable Nation-wide response to this proposal, made very recently.

The gentleman stated a few moments ago that the resolution was before the Committee on Rules. I feel that it is of great importance that this proposal be brought out as early as possible. We are near the end of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. I wonder if in the opinion of my colleague it might be possible to get action on this proposal before the beginning of the second session in January? Is there anything to indicate any immediate action on the proposal by the Committee on Rules?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I greatly appreciate the gentleman's statement and his inquiry. In the first place, I have had very courteous treatment from the members of the Committee on Rules with reference to granting a hearing or getting consideration for granting a hearing. Most of them indicated that they would be willing to grant a hearing. I doubt if we shall be able to get one until the next session. I wish we could at an earlier date. I am sure the gentleman will make a great contribution if he will speak to the members of the Committee on Rules in that regard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee on calling the attention of the House to legislation of this character. I really believe that if proper legislation can be worked out in this regard and is approved it will furnish all Members of the House information they otherwise would not receive, and would put all the Members of Congress in a better position to pass proper and necessary legislation. When that is done, of course, it will inure to the benefit of all the people of our country.

I again congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee on bringing this forward-looking proposal to the attention of the House.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I certainly thank the gentleman. I know he has given the matter a lot of consideration. His comments are very useful and encouraging. His opinion is valued highly.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee on bringing to our attention a statesmanlike possibility, and I second what the gentleman from Texas has already said. Too often too many of us do not know just what is going on. I think it should be the first duty of the administration to give the necessary information to the Members of Congress. I recall, as the rest of the Members of the House do, that the War Department some 2 months ago made a statement in confidence to industrial and labor leaders, and a month and a half later they told us the story in the Library of Congress. If we could put through something on this order, would it not be possible that all of us would be in a position to have a better idea of what was being contemplated and what was actually going on?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think we undoubtedly would. I appreciate the gentleman's favorable remarks.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. There is one thing that troubles me about this. Under our form of Government, the President is the Executive Officer. These Cabinet officials are merely working for him. They are carrying out his will and his wishes. If we carry this proposal to its logical end, would we not require the attendance here of the President himself, so that we might interrogate him, on the theory that we would finally decide, "These are just underlings, they are just hired hands, just working for the President. Why should we fool away our time interrogating them when they can be changed at any time the President wants to change them? If they say something the President does not like, he can fire them and hire somebody else, so we would be interrogating subordinates all the time." Does not the gentleman think the logical conclusion would have to be that eventually we would bring

the President up here and interrogate him?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is a very interesting inquiry. I may say to the gentleman there is absolutely no possibility of the thing he suggests happening. In the first place, this resolution only invites those to appear who are willing to appear. In the second place, the Constitution requires the President to submit a report on the state of the Union once a year, and that is the only duty imposed on the President insofar as consulting the House is concerned.

So we have no other control over him with reference to his appearance before Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. You understand, I am not advocating it, I am just suggesting that perhaps that would be the logical thing if we were to go on this road the gentleman suggests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That same observation as to the committees would be true now. They do not ask the President to appear before the committees, yet they always ask these men.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What would be the difference?

Mr. PATMAN. At the same time they carry out the will and the wishes of the President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the gentleman from Arkansas has answered that question. There would not be any difference between that and the likelihood of calling the President before the committees. This would be more dignified. There would be more of us here and more of us would have an opportunity of hearing what they had to say.

I also wish to point out to the gentleman from Texas that the President is a constitutional officer. His duties are defined by the Constitution. This is not true of the members of the Cabinet. They are nowhere mentioned in the Constitution. They are created by law. We require them to give reports. Under the law establishing the Secretary of the Treasury he may be required to report to Congress in person. A distinction must be drawn between congressional power over the President and the Cabinet members.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to this argument that this might subject us more to the influence of the departments, it seems to me to be exactly the contrary. If we invite these department heads up here and, you might say, put them in the position of having to defend their own policies, it would enhance our own influence over their administration of the laws we pass. It would seem to me that is a logical conclusion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There would seem to be no doubt about that. That seems to be the attitude of those who signed the Senate report, and other eminent students of government have reached the same conclusion as the gentleman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And to go a little further, with regard to the minority's fear that they might not be given an opportunity, it seems to me in the general sense of the thing that it actually is designed perhaps more for the benefit of the opposition or the minority because they would be the ones most likely in the course of things to have criticism of whatever administration is in power, and that is actually the way it works in the British Parliament, is it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it would be another very valuable tool with which we could all work and which would work fairly to the majority and the minority. It would give them an additional way of finding out what is going on, just as it would for those of the majority. I think it would work for the benefit of both sides fairly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so. Personally, I am very much in favor of it.

Mr. FOAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FOAGE. The gentleman from Arkansas has mentioned, as several others have, the possibility of this plan placing the legislative branch at a disadvantage. I realize that he felt it would not place it at a disadvantage; I mean he mentioned the subject matter. But it seems to me in that connection we ought to give consideration to a procedure which, to my mind, is imperative here, whether we adopt this plan or whether we do not. Certainly, if we adopt this plan it seems to me it strengthens the argument for giving our committees a real staff and enabling our committee to be able to conduct some independent investigations by the standing committees. Why should not this Congress implement a reasonable number of committees that handle the various subjects coming before them with a sufficient staff so that they will be able to know something about the subject matter when they are going to interrogate the head of a department? If you do not have anybody to give you any information, and he has 100,000 employees in his department to give him the full information, the Congress would then be at a decided disadvantage. In other words, if we adopt this plan without going ahead and carrying out the plan that has been suggested by many Members here already, that is now pending, of actually implementing the committees and making our standing committees something more than mere figureheads, it seems to me very important we give our standing committees an adequate staff to make the members of each committee familiar with the subject matter. For instance, as I am on the Committee on Agriculture, I will use that as an illustration; I think the members of the Committee on Agriculture ought to have all the information from their own staff that the Secretary of Agriculture can get from his staff. The members of the Foreign Affairs Committee ought to have information from their own staff. I do not have any criticism of either Mr. Wickard or Mr. Hull.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I fully agree with the gentleman we should be better supplied with information and we should have expert staffs of our own. I think that is another proposal under consideration.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. I understand this is entirely a voluntary proposition?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GWYNNE. And these Cabinet officials would appear by invitation? Would that invitation be extended by the House or by the committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The invitation would be extended by the committee having jurisdiction of the type of subject matter that they want the Cabinet officer to discuss.

Mr. GWYNNE. And you would have a limit on the number of times any Cabinet officer could be called?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Rules Committee fixes the priorities and perhaps a better procedure would be, since there might be several requests pending, to let the Rules Committee actually issue the invitation for a particular period.

Mr. GWYNNE. It would be true, of course, if the President did not want any particular Cabinet officer to attend, he could refuse permission to have him attend?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under this resolution I think that is correct. But I think public opinion would deal rather harshly with any officer who did not attend unless he had some very good reason or excuse for not doing so.

Mr. GWYNNE. I am inclined to think it is a very good idea. I trust the matter will be examined by the committee having charge of it. I think it is entitled to consideration.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee. I think he has put his finger on one of the real needs of this Congress. We, after all, in this body are the best hopes of democracy. Our job in carrying on will be dependent on the tools we have to work with. The most vital tool is one of information. The best way we can get information is from the source itself. The gentleman is advocating a procedure that will give us part of that information. In conjunction with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has mentioned about better supplying Congress with a staff of technicians of committees, I would like to call his attention to the proposal which I have made in conjunction with Senator MALONEY in a concurrent resolution to provide for a bipartisan committee from both Houses to study ways and means of improving our own congressional machinery to deal with these ever-increasing problems, and to also study relationships between Congress

and departments downtown, because I believe any thoughtful student of this Government realizes we cannot expect to do the job unless we have the proper equipment to do it with.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is very farseeing in his ideas about improving the machinery of government. I am interested in his resolution. I hope we can have favorable action on it also.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman who just preceded me has dwelt on the fact that we can get more information furnished all around by the procedure suggested. I want to call attention to the fact that we can get better spirit among all. When I spoke a moment ago about the gulf existing between this Congress and the departments of government, I mean just exactly that. There is today suspicion and ill will, possibly because we Members do not know that the men down in the departments are working earnestly for the benefit of this Government, just as we are. If we do know it, we ignore it, evidently. I find in consulting with them, from the highest to the lowest with whom I have consulted, that they are working for the best interest of the Government, and we are working for the best interests of the Government. I think it was Mark Twain who said, concerning a neighbor that he did not think much of:

I do not want to get better acquainted with him. I might learn to like him.

In my opinion, if we could get better acquainted with the administrative officials who are carrying on their stated duties, there would be a better spirit all around as well as more information.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree with the gentleman. The great part of our executive officers are trying their best to do their duty. Those few who are not, or, who are not following the intentions of Congress, ought to be called here, and we should have an accounting from them, to see why they have not done their duty.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I regret that I was unable to hear the questions of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. Perhaps he touched on the thing that I would like to be clear about myself. As I understand from what the distinguished gentleman has already said with reference to his resolution, the invitations to be extended can only be issued by a Committee of the House. Am I correct in that?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have seen many instances where questions of great moment were before this House. The thought occurs to me that the House might also want the right, by resolution, or by motion passed by a majority of the Members, to invite Members of the Cabinet, such as the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman, that this resolution is not intended to take the place of any right which we have now. It is to set up a regular procedure for periods and reports. We have certain rights of inquiry now by resolution if we would use it. In any event, that should be allowed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman agrees that the House should have that right if it does not have it now?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very important letter I wanted to read, and I have not had an opportunity to read it. I would like to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other special orders. Those members are present.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman.

The other great man and statesman most able to give us counsel on this proposal is the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren. Because of his long and useful service in the House, Mr. Warren is a staunch believer in Congress. He is our friend, and every one of us knows it. He is intimately acquainted with the machinery of Congress and with our needs. As Comptroller General he is now in an important executive position. He can also view the picture from the executive angle. The office of the Comptroller General is an agency of Congress. It was created by Congress. It is responsible to Congress. Because of this, and because of Mr. Warren's peculiar fitness to pass on the question, I felt justified in asking his official opinion of this resolution. On November 24 I wrote Mr. Warren the following letter:

NOVEMBER 24, 1943.

HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDSAY: On October 19 I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives to amend the rules of the House to provide for a question period at which heads of executive departments and independent agencies would be requested to appear and answer questions. A sympathetic debate on this resolution ensued in the House on November 12, 1 week before Secretary Hull made a personal report to Congress on the Moscow Conference.

You, because of your long, active, and useful service as a Member of the House, have a first-hand knowledge of the needs of the Congress for better information and of the desirability of keeping in closer touch with the administration of laws.

You, as Comptroller General, an agent of Congress, the head of one of the most important departments, can also advise us as to whether this plan would be helpful to the executive departments.

I would greatly appreciate your writing me your views on this proposal. Because of the high esteem in which you are held by the Members of the House, and the fact that you have seen service in both branches of our

Government, I feel that your views would be of especial value.

I am enclosing a copy of the resolution. It is, of course, rudimentary—something to use to begin consideration.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

Following is the reply I received from Mr. Warren:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, November 25, 1943.

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ESTES: I am in receipt of your letter of November 24, enclosing a copy of House Resolution 327 introduced by you on October 19, 1943, which would amend the rules of the House to provide for a question period at which heads of executive departments and independent agencies would be requested to appear and answer questions. I am very glad to submit to you my views on the subject as requested by you.

While I have not studied the language of the resolution, it is, as you say, rudimentary and is something to use to begin consideration. I very strongly favor the proposal both personally and officially. While a Member of the House, I held this view many years ago and recall that I spoke on it before a luncheon club in North Carolina. Since I have been out of Congress and holding the position of Comptroller General of the United States I favor the proposal even more than formerly.

I am somewhat acquainted with the English system, where I understand it works well in the House of Commons. Why should not the House of Representatives make it also workable and informing? While heads of departments and independent agencies are constantly called before committees of the Congress, what sound reason can be advanced why, on stated occasions, they should not be called before a session of the House itself? What does the House as a whole know about any particular department or agency or its policy on a given subject? Why, if not contrary to the public interest, would an administrator object to answering questions that the House might desire answered?

It is true that annual reports are required to be submitted to the Congress. But, no matter how thorough and good they might be—and some of them are quite informing—do you know of anyone who really reads them? I am sure many Members throw them in the wastebasket or merely file them away, never to be read, the minute the postman brings them in. On many measures exhaustive hearings are held covering at times volumes of printed matter.

Only a handful of Members read all of the hearings on a bill. They simply don't have time to do it. When a Member of the House, I thought I was reasonably active and alert, but I found that I read more hearings in a month as Comptroller General than I did in the 16 years I was a Member of the House. If a department or agency head was before the House as a whole for 2 hours, the Members could get more information in that time than they could ever get from annual reports, hearings or correspondence, as I assume that on the day the "question period" was held there would be a large attendance of Members.

The terms of your resolution sufficiently prevent it from being used as a vehicle for heckling and harassing administrators. I have always observed that if anyone has anything to say, he is given respectful attention by the House. However, it would certainly have a leavening effect if the man who is responsible for the expenditure of appropriated funds would know that the branch of

the Government that gave him those funds could publicly question him about his administration. At the same time the proposal could prove of inestimable value to a careful administrator who has been misunderstood by possibly many Members of the House. He would be given the means of presenting his problem with far better and broader effect than he could ever hope to achieve before either a small committee or in a written communication. Thus, the proposal would be a timesaver for a busy administrator, as he would have the opportunity, at one appearance, to acquaint the entire House membership with much of the work of his office, to supply information to clear up any misunderstanding or misapprehensions which might exist in the minds of Members and to present his views on pending legislation affecting his office and its problems.

Speaking for myself, while I have no idea how long I shall serve as Comptroller General, once more I point out that the Comptroller General is the agent of the Congress, and it seems to me that anyone holding this position would welcome the opportunity of being called before the House, as your resolution would provide. It would be peculiarly appropriate for the House to question its own agent, not only about the General Accounting Office, but about matters in other agencies that have come to his attention.

I believe your proposal, if adopted, will prove of the greatest value both to the House and to the administrative departments and independent agencies.

With high esteem, I am,
Sincerely,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

How could a stronger argument for the plan be made? Who is better able to testify on the merits of the proposal? Where can we find a more competent witness? Lindsay Warren values his friendship with the Members of this House. He has our interest at heart. He is anxious for Congress to regain and retain its position in the Government. Does not his strong endorsement, alone, justify us in giving this proposal a trial?

Why are we afraid to try new methods? Remember it can be done by a very simple change of the rules of the House. If the practice does not meet our expectations, we can, by a majority vote, repeal the rule. In that case the Nation would at least give us credit for trying to improve the tools we work with. The people of this country want us to do that. They want a strong Congress; one able to hold its own with the executive departments. The wide and mostly favorable comment on this simple resolution is strong evidence of that fact.

When this proposal has been presented from time to time, it is interesting to note that on occasions it was rejected because of opposition in Congress; on other occasions, because of opposition from the executive departments. Some people have argued against it on the theory that it would give the Congress too much power over the Executive. Other people have opposed the idea because they thought it might give the Executive an undue influence over Congress. Surely there must be some middle ground. There must be some way we can get better information, some way we can secure better accounting from the departments. There must be some method by which we can improve teamwork.

I think this is a proper time to bring out the objections that have been put forth against this idea whenever it has been advocated. It is said that allowing executives to consult with Members of the House on the floor is not in keeping with the spirit of our Constitution. Under the Constitution each House makes its own rules.

Another objection frequently made by the opponents of modernizing our methods of communication through the suggested procedure is that it might be in violation of the tradition of the House. That is, they say that no person, except a Member of the House, should be permitted to appear and address the House. I do not think Mr. Hull's recent appearance did any damage to our tradition. As a matter of fact, I think the prominence given the House by his appearance was a definite help to the standing of Congress.

Under the constitutional power of the House to fix its own rules, each House admits a chaplain to open the proceedings with prayer. Under this power the House of Representatives admits contestants to argue their title to membership, and sometimes admits counsel to argue in the same behalf. By the act of 1817 each Territory—

shall have the right to send a Delegate to the House of Representatives, each such Delegate shall have a seat in the House of Representatives with the right of debating, but not of voting.

Under this authority the Delegates of the Territories sit today in the House of Representatives and participate in its debates. I think this is a very wholesome way to find out the needs and problems of the Territories. I do not see that it adversely affects the tradition of the House. Some Members seem to be afraid of the idea because it is new. As a matter of fact, it is not new. No President addressed Congress in person from the time of Jefferson until President Wilson revived the practice. When it was revived it was something new and objection was made on that ground. Yet it is a wholesome and worth-while practice and I hope it is continued. The economic, international, and social situation of our Nation and people have changed rapidly since the early days of the Republic. Congress must keep pace with these changes. We have to adopt new techniques. Can no progress be made because of the newness of the idea?

Many distinguished Members of the House and Senate drew up the Constitution of the Confederate States. Its framers thought that good results might be obtained by establishing intercourse between the executive and legislative departments. Accordingly, in the Confederate Constitution after the words—

And no person holding any office under the Confederate States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office—

The identical provision of the Federal Constitution upon which it was modeled—the following clause was introduced:

but Congress may by law grant to the principal officers in each of the executive de-

partments a seat upon the floor of either House with the privilege of discussing any measures appertaining to his department.

And let us remember the Constitution of the Confederate States was modeled after the Federal Constitution. It had the same provisions for separate divisions.

I think it should be pointed out again that this proposal has a long history. A committee of the House, headed by Congressman Pendleton, unanimously recommended the adoption of a similar plan in 1864. A distinguished committee of the Senate, headed by Senator Pendleton, unanimously recommended the adoption of this idea by the Senate in 1881. Governor Montague, of Virginia, when a Member of the House advocated adopting the idea and made several scholarly addresses in its favor. At the last Congress, Hon. William R. Thom, of Ohio, filed a bill to authorize Cabinet members to participate in debate. His remarks on the subject were well considered and pertinent.

I could give you hundreds of recommendations by former Members of Congress, executives, historians, and other prominent Americans, urging favorable consideration of this means of communication. I will name only a few of our leaders who have advocated this procedure and will read short extracts from some of their statements in favor of it. These men are good authorities upon whom we can rely. In their statements are found many good reasons for the adoption of this system.

President William Howard Taft, in his message to Congress made December 19, 1912, made a forceful argument for adoption of this proposal. He said in part:

There has been much lost motion in the machinery of Congress due to the lack of co-operation and interchange of views face to face between the representatives of the Executive and the Members of the two legislative branches of the Government. It was never intended they should be separated in the sense of not being in constant effective touch and relationship to each other. The legislature and Executive each perform its own appropriation functions, but these functions must be coordinated. I do not think that I am mistaken in saying that the presence of the members of the Cabinet on the floor of each House would greatly contribute to the enactment of helpful legislation.

Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes, in 1924, when Secretary of State, said:

It ought to be possible for Cabinet officers to take part in debate in both Houses on matters touching their departments and thus be able to give exact information and to defend themselves against unjust attacks. Under the present arrangement a Cabinet officer often hears of misunderstandings and of an outpouring of mistaken notions which a brief statement from him would have corrected, but the misapprehension has been voiced and has gone through the country perhaps never to be overtaken.

We can preserve the advantages of stability and enhance the opportunity of Executive leadership, not by overriding the cherished prerogatives of the Congress or by attempting to gain an illicit advantage for the leadership but having a recognized contact through the regular admission of Cabinet officers to the floor of the House of Congress.

The late Elihu Root wrote, April 20, 1935:

It has long seemed clear to me that we ought to have some arrangement under which Congress would have the benefit of more prompt and authoritative information as to the action of the executive department.

On the other hand, I think that a sense of liability of prompt explanation has a very good effect upon the head and the leading members of an executive department.

The Honorable John W. Davis wrote, March 19, 1936:

I have always thought it would be a good thing if members of the Cabinet were given the privilege of the floor of either House of Congress.

Congress, having control of its own procedure, can undoubtedly inaugurate such a system if it wants to. I am not sure that each House could not do it on its own account. One of the greatest advantages of the attempt is that it could be abandoned if it proves a failure, without any permanent amendment to the Constitution.

I do not remember that I have ever discussed the subject in any public address, but I am quite willing to be quoted in favor of the experiment.

President James A. Garfield said:

Who does not know that the enactment of such a law will tend to bring our ablest men into the Cabinet of the Republic? Who does not know that if a man is to be responsible to his executive acts and also be able to tell why he proposes new measures, and to comprehend the whole scope of his duties, weak men will shirk from taking such places? Who does not know that it will call out the best talent of the land, both executive and parliamentary? It is the silent, secret influence that saps and undermines the fabric of republics, and not the open appeal, the collision between intellects, the array of facts. I hope that this measure will be fairly considered. If it does not pass now, the day will come, I believe, when it will pass. When that day comes I expect to see a higher type of American statesmanship, not only in the Cabinet but in legislative halls.

On another occasion President Garfield said:

I have long believed that the official relations between the Executive and Congress should be more open and direct. They are now conducted by correspondence with the presiding officers of the two Houses, by consultation with committees, or by private interviews with individual Members. This frequently leads to misunderstanding, and may lead to corrupt combinations. It would be far better for both departments if the members of the Cabinet were permitted to sit in Congress and participate in the debates on measures relating to their several departments—but, of course, without a vote. This would tend to secure the ablest men for the chief executive offices; it would bring the policy of the administration into the fullest publicity by giving both parties ample opportunity for criticism and defense.

President Woodrow Wilson, Committee on Cabinet Government? *Overland Monthly*, volume 3, third session, January 1884, page 25, said:

Cabinet government would, moreover, put the necessary bit in the mouth of beast caucus, and reduce him to his proper service, for it would secure open-doored government. It would not suffer legislation to skulk in committee closets and caucus conferences. Light is the only thing that can sweeten our political atmosphere—light thrown upon every detail of administration in the departments * * *

It cannot be too often repeated that while Congress remains the supreme power of the State, it is idle to talk of steadying or cleansing our politics without in some way linking together the interests of the Executive and the Legislature. So long as these two great branches are isolated, they must be ineffective just to the extent of the isolation. Congress will always be master, and will always enforce its commands on the administration. The only wise plan, therefore, is to facilitate its direction of the Government and to make it at the same time responsible, in the persons of its leaders, for the acts of control and for the manner in which its plans and commands are executed. The only hope of wrecking the present clumsy misrule of Congress lies in the establishment of responsible Cabinet government. Let the interests of the Legislature be indissolubly linked with the interests of the Executive. Let those who have authority to direct the course of legislation be those who have a deep personal concern in building up the executive departments in effectiveness, in strengthening law, and in unifying policies; men whose personal reputation depends upon successful administration, whose public station originates in the triumph of principles, and whose dearest ambition it is to be able to vindicate their wisdom and maintain their integrity.

Committee government is too clumsy and too clandestine a system to last. Other methods of government must sooner or later be sought, and a different economy established. First or last, Congress must be organized in conformity with what is now the prevailing legislative practice of the world. English precedent and the world's fashion must be followed in the institution of Cabinet government in the United States.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, and one of our greatest authorities on American government, in his excellent book, *Is America Worth Saving*, at page 60, had this to say:

The business of national government has become so huge and so complex that the sharp separation of the executive and the legislative powers to which we have been accustomed for 140 years, is now distinctly disadvantageous. It brings in its train lack of coherence and of continuity in public policy; it conceals from the people much that they should know, and it prevents effective and quick cooperation between the Congress and the executive departments, both in times of emergency and in the conduct of the ordinary business of government. There is a way to overcome these embarrassments and difficulties without in any way altering the form of our government or breaking down the wise safeguards which the Constitution contains. That is to provide by law, as may be done very simply, that the members of the Cabinet shall be entitled to occupy seats on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives, with the right to participate in debate on matters relating to the business of their several departments, under such rules as the Senate and House, respectively, may prescribe. Such an act should further provide that the members of the Cabinet must attend sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives at designated times, in order to give information asked by resolution or to reply to questions which may be propounded to them under the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Were such a custom to be established an almost certain result would be the selection as heads of the great executive departments of men of large ability and personal force—men able to explain and to defend their policies and measures before the Congress of the United States in the face of the whole country. It would also follow that

the Nation's Legislature would be enabled to exercise a more intelligent and a more effective control over the executive departments than is now the case, as well as to render them more intelligent and more effective aid in the form both of appropriations and of positive law.

When Representative Clyde Kelly, of Pennsylvania, became the champion of the proposal, in the course of his campaign for it he asked the views of Mr. Hoover, then a Cabinet member. In replying, June 23, 1922, Mr. Hoover said he believed this one of the most constructive steps that could be taken in furthering the development of our political machinery.

There are in my mind overwhelming arguments that can be introduced in favor of this change in our traditions. I do not believe that any fundamental criticism can be directed against it except by those who would deliberately exaggerate it as an attempt to establish a form of parliamentary government. Anyone who understands the basis of such European organization will at once recognize that the step you propose has no relation whatever to this form of government.

Dr. Charles A. Beard, the noted historian, stated:

This (requiring Cabinet members to attend Congress) should have a wholesome influence on both departments of government. Again and again Congress enacts laws in vague and general terms, leaving interpretation and application to executive authority. In such cases it frequently happens that the administrator departs, or seems to depart, from the intention of the legislation, assuming that it was ever clearly formulated. The Members of Congress attack the administration on the floor and the administration fires volleys through the press at Members of Congress. Not an edifying spectacle. More than that, it delays, confuses, and hampers the transaction of business. Every issue of this character should be defended on the floor of Congress with the parties in interest face to face, the press watching, and the country informed.

Justice Story, *The Constitution*, section 869, said:

The heads of the departments are, in fact, thus precluded from proposing or vindicating their own measures in the face of the Nation in the course of debate, and are compelled to submit them to other men who are either imperfectly acquainted with the measures or are indifferent to their success or failure. Thus that open and public responsibility for measures which properly belongs to the executive in all governments, and especially in a republican government, as its greatest security and strength, is completely done away. The executive is compelled to resort to secret and unseen influences, to private interviews, and private arrangements to accomplish its own appropriate purposes, instead of proposing and sustaining its own duties and measures by a bold and manly appeal to the Nation in the face of its representatives. One consequence of this state of things is, that there never can be traced home to the executive any responsibility for the measures which are planned and carried at its suggestion. Another consequence will be (if it has not yet been) that measures will be adopted or defeated by private intrigues, political combinations, irresponsible recommendations, and all the blandishments of office, and all the deadening weight of silent patronage.

Francis E. Leupp, *The Cabinet in Congress*, Atlantic Monthly, December 1917, pages 774-775, 776-777:

The presence and consultation of Cabinet officers while Congress is debating important bills would reduce to a minimum the exercise of the President's veto power, and thus avert a deal of friction. * * *

Such a change of practice as I have been advocating would materially abridge the activities of the lobby, with advantage to the political morals of the Nation. * * *

* * * the argument most commonly urged against the project which has furnished my present text: that the American Cabinet, unlike the cabinet of a country under parliamentary government, has no independent or organic standing. It is not mentioned in the Constitution, its nearest approach to recognition there being the authorization of the President to "require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices." We are asked, therefore, how we could fitly dignify these outsiders as the direct representatives of the President, and seat them in the Halls of Congress to speak and advise in his name.

The answer is, that we are contemplating no radical innovation. The laws creating what we call the Cabinet offices, in some instances explicitly, and in all by implication, make their occupants, as it were, the living instruments of the President in the performance of his complex functions; and the solemn acts of the heads of departments have long been given effect, even for judicial purposes, as acts of the President. How well rooted this conception of the Cabinet has become in the minds of Congress and the people is evidenced by the law, enacted in 1886 after an exhaustive discussion, placing the heads of departments, in the order of their official seniority, in the line of succession in the event of a temporary vacancy of the Presidency and Vice Presidency. This provision seems to give them a recognizable and highly important standing in the Government, whether or not they ever had one before.

As to their bodily presence on the floor of Congress, surely it involves no worse incongruity than the presence there of a group of Territorial Delegates who for many years have been sitting and speaking in the House and doing substantially everything that regular Members are entitled to do, except vote, and we are asking no more for our Cabinet officers. If such a privilege is granted to representatives of minor bodies of our population not yet organized into full-participating political units, on what pretext shall we deny it to a group of Federal officers who in a peculiar sense represent the entire body politic for purposes of commenting on pending legislation? Nobody raises a protest against an outsider being brought into either Hall to conduct, as Chaplain, the religious exercises at the opening of every day's session, or against the services of another outsider, the Sergeant at Arms, when he uses the symbols of force to compel good behavior among the law-makers elected by the people. Nay, it is within the range of possibility that the House may decide one day to have an outsider for its Speaker; there is not a word in the Constitution to forbid it, and within a dozen years the question has been quietly mooted. Concerning the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Constitution is similarly silent; and I remember its being seriously proposed, during the readjuster deadlock of 1881, that the Senate avert a threatened crisis by taking this officer from private life. So it seems not unfair to discard the familiar "outsider" objection as too fragile to block the way of a desired improvement.

Roland Young, in his excellent treatise entitled "This is Congress," published in 1943, had this to say at page 258:

The process of communication could be further advanced by allowing the important administrative heads to speak directly to Congress from time to time. There is now a considerable amount of irresponsible criticism of administrators in both Houses, and especially in the House of Representatives, and I believe that this irresponsibility would be decreased, that congressional knowledge would be increased, and that members of the administration would be better able to justify their policy if they could speak directly to Congress. Congressional hearings are now a very important factor in improving the communications between the administration and Congress, but they go only part way; many hearings are poorly attended, which means that the witnesses waste their talents before a slim and unrepresentative audience. Many Members of Congress cannot conveniently attend these hearings, and, if they do attend, they cannot participate. On the other hand, members of the administration cannot now appear before Congress to answer charges made against them. No matter how severe the criticism, unjust or otherwise, the man who is attacked cannot answer the charges himself. I do not propose that the Cabinet be given seats in Congress; that would be too great a waste of time for the benefit which would accrue. I do suggest, however, that on certain occasions members of the Cabinet and other important administrative officers be allowed to address the Houses of Congress and to submit themselves to questioning. They do this now at press conferences. They do this now at congressional hearings. But they do not do it before Congress, and I feel that this type of direct communication between Congress and the administrators would reinvigorate the congressional process.

I wish to point out that the Pendleton bill and all subsequent bills and resolutions followed the line of permitting Cabinet members and administrators to sit on the floor of the House and participate in debate affecting their departments. Many Members of Congress objected on the idea that these executives would be around Congress too much of the time, would interfere with our business and that undignified wrangles would result. It is with these objections in mind that I provided in House Resolution 327 that the executives come to the House at a particular time and for a particular purpose. They would not be here at any other time. To prevent the asking of impertinent or irrelevant questions, and to make sure that the discussion was in line with the matter under consideration, the resolution provides for a screening of the questions to be asked the executive.

I know that this plan can be made to work. I am sure it will be beneficial to us, to the executive departments, and to the Nation. I hope you will give it a trial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts and quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BILLS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LEFEVRE. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight to-

night to file a report on the bill H. R. 3621 and the bill H. R. 3691.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

NEWSPAPER ATTACKS ON MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time there was a deliberate, a long-continued effort to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives. That campaign was climaxed before the 1942 election, when the New Republic, the Daily Worker, the New Masses, PM, the Chicago Sun, and several other publications, which reflect the views of the Communists and the New Dealers, charged some 96 Members of the House and Senate with being disloyal. The overwhelming repudiation of that campaign of vilification, hate, and falsehood at the next election caused it to lose some of its force. It lost in volume and it lost in bitterness. Apparently it is now being renewed under cover and by similar publications. The administration's radio creator of disunity and disseminator of falsehood is again on the air. To me it is more than passing strange that two of the worshipers at the New Deal footstool—Blair Moody, of the Detroit News, and Helen Essary, who writes in the Washington Times-Herald—should so far forget themselves as to print articles which are not only false but which can have no purpose other than to ridicule, to belittle, to disgrace Members of Congress.

Blair Moody knows personally many Members of Congress, he has had lunch with more than one of them in this same restaurant. He, when he wishes, eats at the table maintained in the same lunchroom for members of the press, and he uses the press gallery and all its facilities, paid for by tax money, for his business as a reporter, from which he makes a living. He has been doing it, he will continue to do it, and his paper—the Detroit News—will continue to use the press gallery provided by a subsidy but it will lie about Congressmen who pay full price for all they eat in the Capitol. He knows that no one ever had there a meal or lunch which was worth more than it cost. He knows every one of the Michigan Members of the House, and, while this article from the Detroit News charges that our meals are subsidized, Blair knows that charge is false. He may not have written the article himself, but he is the guiding spirit of the staff of the News and he has not repudiated it.

One of these articles, the one printed after the vote on subsidies, can serve no useful purpose. It can tend only—and that seems to be the apparent pur-

pose—to make the people believe that their representatives in Congress—the Senators and the Members of the House—shall I say, are crooked? That we are dishonest? That is about what it amounts to, that we can be bought, and that we can be bought for the price of a meal or several meals. It would not be so bad if these two writers and the radio announcer who followed the same line would confine themselves to the truth. They know that Congressmen must eat. They know the House meets at 12. They know there is no other place where we can eat and also attend to our duties. They know we have paid for lunches there the price fixed by the O. P. A.

Take the Essary article. In that it is pointed out that the restaurants operated in the Senate and in the House suffered a loss in 1942 of \$85,000. Then the lady—sweet Helen, we might call her—divides the \$85,000 by the number of Senators and Congressmen, 531, and arrives at the figure of \$160, which amount she says the Congressmen voted themselves as a food subsidy. Of course, these 2 writers are sore; that is a common term. When you get the veneer off they are just common folks. They are just sore because they did not get their New Deal way. They are just lacking in fairness, in truthfulness, in the milk of human kindness, in charitable impulses when they write such articles. What they are like ordinarily, I do not know, but those qualities are what they lacked at that particular time when those articles were written. For this reason: It is not true that the Members benefited by \$160 each. They give the impression that those restaurants are operated only for Members. I will confine myself to the House restaurant, which by the way did not operate in 1942 at a loss of \$85,000 but at a loss of \$20,508, while the cafeteria—and something more will be said of that later—over in the new House Office Building operated at a profit of \$3,506. And by the way, many of us eat over at the cafeteria; and for myself I may say that I would be glad to eat the 1 meal a day which I am forced to eat on Capitol Hill at the cafeteria if it were possible to get over there and back from the time we are called at 12 o'clock noon and the time we adjourn without being off the floor when business is being transacted. I would prefer to eat over there because the room is larger, it is airy and clean, the food is better, and we are not crowded. But our duties require us to be over here at 12 o'clock and unfortunately the restaurant on the ground floor is the only place we can get a lunch, unless it be in the lunchrooms at the back of the Chamber. Many of us eat there. I sometimes carry my lunch, and on occasion become interested here on the floor and forget about it. I think we should use this occasion, this question having been brought up, as a spur to induce the House of Representatives to provide for us a decent eating place where we can get a decent meal at a fair price; and I might say, too, that I am charitable enough to continue the custom of which the lady made no mention—nor did Blair

Moody—that permits the members of the press to have a table set aside for them down there where they may continue to eat with us, as they have for years. I hope, too, that their consciences will not bother them when they sit down and partake of the taxpayers' generosity—if that is what it is.

Helen herself eats down there because she said in this little article on Tuesday—and that was the day we had the turkey lunch—it was not Thanksgiving, it was Tuesday. On Tuesday she said:

I had a tenderloin steak sandwich there with french-fried potatoes and that extra cup of coffee for 50 cents.

On that item the menu reads: "Tenderloin steak sandwich, french-fried potatoes, coleslaw, 50 cents."

Well, if she paid but 50 cents and had a cup of coffee she cheated the waiter out of a nickel because it costs Members 5 cents for every cup of coffee we drink except when we buy the regular 60-cent lunch. Now, she had better hustle down and give the House restaurant to apply on the deficit which will occur this year that nickel which she owes for that cup of coffee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. If she only paid 50 cents for that lunch and had two cups of coffee then it is not a nickel she cheated the waiter out of but a dime.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. I wanted to be generous with the lady.

She gave the impression that the House restaurant—in fact she says as much—that the House restaurant was operated exclusively for the benefit of Congress. As, for example, when she divided the amount of its deficit by the number of Senators and Congressmen. Now the woman knows that is not true. Of course, being a woman she is entitled to make a few misstatements, but she should not broadcast them all over the country, especially when she knows her statements are not true. That is not fair. She knew when she wrote that article that many of the meals down there that are paid for by Congressmen are served to their constituents, taxpayers who contribute to that so-called subsidy she writes about.

She knows that there is a large table there in the House restaurant over next to the wall set aside for employees, or secretaries of Members who have to come over on duty while we are in session, matters pertaining to our office work. She knows that the largest table is set aside for members of the press.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a small correction?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The lady evidently does not know that according to testimony given before our subcommittee in relation to this matter that approximately 900 people eat meals down there each day. All of us know that scarcely one-third of the House membership partake each day down at the restaurant.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I hope the gentleman will not fail to mention while he is discussing this question the fact that across the hall from the House restaurant is one exclusively for the public.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the lady knew, and so did Blair Moody, and so did the radio announcer who tried to discredit Congressmen that a large section of the restaurant which is supposed to be for the use of Members is used by employees about the House and that just across the hall and served from the same kitchen, at the same price, is a restaurant under the same management where the public may eat the same kind of food served House employees, reporters, and Congressmen in the House restaurant.

I may say further that I have never seen any Member of the House sit down at the table set aside for our friends up there in the press gallery. Go down, boys and girls of the press, and get in on this so-called subsidy. We of the House are always glad to see you there. Watch closely when Blair and Helen eat—you will never see either choking over any subsidy meal because of a strained conscience. I do not blame the reporters, because they have to earn a living just as you and I, and unfortunately or otherwise they have to eat and there is no other place for them to eat. I do not blame them for writing the news. I do not blame them for being critical. That is their privilege. Let them hop to it. Any man who cannot take it should not be in Congress. But when unfair articles like these two go out, we should correct them even though we know we cannot fight the press. In fact, sometimes their critical remarks get votes for us back in our districts. I concede the ability of the reporters, they are here and sometimes they take my hide off. And with that I find no fault when they write the facts. But I wish they would pass the information along to their editors, when those editors and publishers are telling us what skunks we are and when they attempt to advise us on every question, while they continue to be responsible to no one, mind you, while they never stand for election, that those editors and publishers be patriotic enough to go into the districts and run for the House or Senate, come down here and give our poor, benighted people who selected us good, competent, honest, patriotic legislators and competent service. Send one or two of your editors or columnists over into my district and perhaps the district will get something worth while.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Let the RECORD show that if we did not have this restaurant down here, it is probably a mile downtown, and if the Members went downtown to eat, as this article would indicate

we should, the expense to the Government would be many times what it is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, the gentleman is wrong. That is not the lady's idea at all. You are a big, husky man from Texas, you ought to be able to go from morning until night without anything to eat. You ought to be able to go up to this "greasy elbow" on the corner and get something to eat. Do you know that at Ted's place you can get a meal for less than we pay down here?

Mr. POAGE. About half.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; not half. For about 10 or 15 cents less, and a better meal at that. I have been back and forth, but I cannot go over there all the time. I cannot get the time when the House meets at 12 and continues in session until late in the afternoon.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman went over there it would be a loss to the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would not go that far. It might be a benefit to the Government. According to some radio commentators, some editors, and writers of columns, the country could do without all of us while they directed the Government.

Mr. POAGE. Let the RECORD show also that the cost in the reporters' dining room is exactly the same as it is to the Congressmen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the gentleman talking about? There is no reporters' room. They eat with us, in the same room, at a table reserved for them.

Mr. POAGE. The reporters' table, then. They all get the same food at the same price we do. There is no discrimination in favor of Congressmen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I knew that, and so did Blair and Helen.

Mr. POAGE. Well, let the RECORD show it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; we all knew that. And we all know that the public gets the same food, the same service, at the same price under the same management in the same building in a room not 20 feet from where we eat.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; we knew it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They talk about a turkey dinner. It was not a dinner; it was a lunch. Why, over in the Pentagon Building they served a turkey dinner for 30 cents. We should have gone over there.

Mr. POAGE. And the Government paid for that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I had some of that turkey served last Tuesday downstairs. I do not know whether you fellows ate the dressing or not. I did not. I am not blaming the cooks down there, I am not blaming the waiters nor the management. But go down and look through the kitchen, look down there where our food is prepared. It is in an old hole down there is at a disadvantage. Most, if not all, are on part-time. Some are underpaid. Why have we not the sense and the courage to feed ourselves at least as well or intelligently as we feed our hogs and cattle back home on the farm? Why have we not that much

sense? We do not do it. What did Dr. Calver say the other day in that published article of his? He said we were overworked. That may be news to some of you. I always thought we did overwork on occasions. He said our food was not what it ought to be, that we do not get our meals on time. That because of the rush and worry our stomachs get out of order. He said we were pushed this way and that. And here comes Helen and—about us to our people—we will have many, many letters to answer because of her false statements. It is our own fault that we do not have better food and a less crowded place in which to eat. Why do we let that go on? Because we are afraid of what the press will tell the public. Now, let us tell the press to go to for once in our existence and get ourselves a dining room, a lunchroom, or whatever you want to call it, equal to that which we have provided for the secretaries over in the New House Office Building, a kitchen that is clean and airy, a dining room with plenty of room, and food over there better than we get down here and on which the Government last year made a profit of over \$3,000. These worshipers at the New Deal shrine jump on us, they print in the Detroit paper a picture of Republican Congressmen who, they falsely claim, vote themselves a subsidy and then deny a subsidy to the people around the country. That ought to be news to you, Brother PATMAN, you eat down there. Maybe that is why you voted for subsidies in the end. How silly the charge, how false, how harmful, how small and mean—yes, just mean and false.

Listen, that place down there that these two brilliant New Deal worshipers are squawking about is operated by the New Deal. Republicans are not in charge—the O. P. A. fixes the prices. What are they hollering about? Why not get after Eleanor on one of her frequent visits home, have her come down here, inspect the kitchen and eat a meal there once. Everyone knows what that food is down there. It is all right for one meal. Our constituents come in, we take them down there, as we are happy to do, and they like the food, but when you eat down there day after day, day after day, if you are like I am you put down as much as you can because you have to live, then you go on your way.

Mr. CLEVELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVELER. Old No. 6 came in downstairs with that slice of turkey. I was listening to the gentleman who substituted the other night for Fulton Lewis. That was broadcast all over the country, to millions of people. I gathered from what he said that we had about a five- or six-course turkey dinner down there that day. I wondered how I missed it. I had the same thing the gentleman did, a mess of questionable dressing with a little slice of turkey on top of it. That is all it was that Old No. 6 brought in.

Mr. **HOFFMAN**. Then the lady says here, "or a chef's special 'A': fresh Mississippi shrimp, sea-food style, with steamed rice, coffee, tea, or milk, and that extra pat of butter, for a mere 35 cents."

I cannot find it on there. And I hold in my hand Tuesday's menu.

Mr. **ANGELL**. It is not on there.

Mr. **HOFFMAN**. I cannot see it. Anyway, why should she sweat her shirt, that is what I want to know. She was out that day herself. Of course, she did not pay for it, a friend of hers paid for it, I assume, for she was a guest. I read the caption:

SOCIETY

Mrs. Edward Beale McLean holds annual Thanksgiving Day breakfast with 200 attending.

The lady finds a lot of fault with the Members of Congress, including the Senators, for getting in on this turkey luncheon, but she has no objection to associating with people—Senators who may vote against subsidies—that she intimates are disreputable, crooked, and a little bit off color, because in the paper here I find a long list of Senators and their wives she had breakfast with. It is a "breakfast" according to this writer in this paper. They had for lunch—what did they have?

Mr. **POAGE**. What time of day did they have that breakfast?

Mr. **HOFFMAN**. I do not know. It is breakfast in one paper and it is lunch in the other. Did they eat it all day? The article in one paper is by Betty Hynes and the other is by Betty Milliken. I do not know those girls, but anyway, Betty Hynes writes about the breakfast and Betty Milliken writes about the luncheon.

Betty Milliken says:

The luncheon menu consisted of turkey, with chestnut dressing, sweet potatoes, cranberry sauce, and peas, served with sauterne—

What kind of a food is that, sauterne?—and a particularly delicious cream cake which was served with coffee later.

Then they had something we did not have.

After luncheon was over—

You see, it started with breakfast and it ended up with lunch, although in fairness I want to say that in my opinion it was all one meal and could not have taken over an hour and a half.

After luncheon was over, the guests strolled in the garden, where numerous statues of famous statesmen, against a setting of boxwood, line a large swimming pool. "Cheesy," a Maltese cat named by one of the maids in the household, hovered about, lending an air of home-like simplicity to an otherwise formal gathering.

Kitty! The claws show in this story by Helen.

You see the way it is, what they are trying to do. Every time they get the stomach ache, every time one of these columnists or how should I describe the female of the species? Anyway, any time one of them gets a little stomach ache,

every time one of them gets a little headache, every time the Congress—and this time it was 2 to 1—every time the Congress, elected by the people, does its honest best to carry out the will of the folks who send us down here, but run counter to their ideas, along they come with a bucketful of abuse and falsehood and give it to us.

I am not complaining about it, do not get that idea. It is all duck soup to me, because the folks at home know that no one has ever been able to give me anything to which I am not entitled. These stories are just another example of the hysteria here in Washington.

They have charged us with everything they could think of for the last 2 years—yes, 4 years, have they not?—and still our folks send us back. So I might suggest that we let our own consciences be our guide, that we go along in the old homely way, that we continue to eat down here as it is the only place we have to eat. I am hoping that a good meal will soothe the dispositions of Helen and Blair, make them more charitable, and they will go back up in the gallery in the afternoons feeling better toward all humanity. Yes, God bless them. It is too bad that their dispositions cause them to print or pass such articles as those.

Now let us get to this question of subsidies and inflation.

ADMINISTRATION HAS INFLATION REMEDY

"Inflation" is the term used to describe a situation or condition where the volume of purchasing power, either by money or credit, exceeds in an unnatural or abnormal degree the volume of purchasable merchandise or service.

Inflation, if continued, results in an apparent prosperity, in a real depression. It first creates fictitious values, then a deflation which wipes out the savings of years.

Inflation and high prices are not synonymous. The law of supply and demand, operating in normal times, together with man's desire for a profit and an avoidance of losses, will prevent ruinous inflation but will not prevent temporarily high prices.

To illustrate, one fall early in married life when wages were low, my own being \$6 a week, there was a scarcity of potatoes and the price was \$5 a bushel. The next spring I planted an acre of potatoes, hoping to make a profit, certain we would eat potatoes without paying \$5 a bushel. Evidently a few others had the same brilliant idea for that fall potatoes were 25 cents a bushel. Wages were still low but no less. Supply and demand got in its work.

Doctors, lawyers, professional men all, for an hour's service often receive many, many times the amount paid to others for work over a like period. We all know of and accept that situation because up to this time there has been a comparative shortage of competent professional men. Hence, they demanded and received greater compensation than others less skilled.

It is unnecessary to give other illustrations to show the difference between

high prices and inflation. High prices originate and may continue for varying periods because of the operation of the law of supply and demand. Nevertheless, they are soon leveled off through the operation of that law. Inflation comes about because of the arbitrary pumping into the economic life of a nation, of abnormal, excessive purchasing power.

It may be brought about by issuing printing-press money, by borrowing, by government credits, or expenditures, which in turn permit excessive profits, by the payment of high wages or profits, by waste and extravagance.

Today we have inflation reflected in an increase in the cost of living. One cause was the spending of billions of dollars in the pre-war period for, to use a broad, general term, "boondoggling." Another cause, and this was unavoidable, was the spending of billions for the war effort. Coupled with the latter spending, however, was the unjustifiable procedure of paying excessive prices for war production. Now it is quite true that because of lack of time, much of the production could not be obtained without waste. But that was only a small part of the unnecessary spending.

Today there is ample proof that the Government has received but a fraction of what it should have received for the dollars expended. Within the month, before a subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, in a plant in which this Government has invested some sixty-odd million dollars, which has war contracts amounting to more than \$130,000,000, the head of the union, responsible for the activities of 18,000 employees, admitted that although the employees had received pay-and-a-half and double pay for overtime and Sunday work, they had been but one-third efficient. They loafed while our men in the service fought and died.

The Detroit News of last week carried the story of a woman reporter who had worked for 2 years in two war plants in Detroit. She wrote that a 2-hour job was stretched into a 10-hour job and that the war plant workers purposely wasted their time in order to spread the work, prolong their jobs.

The Chicago Tribune last week published a series of articles showing that Communists had slowed down production at least 30 percent in numerous war plants in the Chicago area.

The Government, because of the contracts it makes with war industries, pays for this idle time and it pays the industrialists a profit on the time lost, the cost of which goes into the price charged the Government.

The administration, through lend-lease, has paid billions of dollars to foreign governments which in turn have used billions of dollars to finance purchases on the American market, regardless of cost. That sort of buying has tended to increase prices. All these have tended to bring on inflation.

More than 2 years ago from the floor of the House many a Member pointed out that ruinous inflation was on its way

and from the floor of the House the Congressman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] pleaded, yes begged, the House to adopt legislation he offered which would have prevented the conditions which now confront us.

Nevertheless, the administration would have none of it and the House compromised on a bill which was an effort to fix the price of commodities, but which at the President's demand, ignored and left to him the stabilizing of wages which was the other half of the problem.

How silly, how absurd to pretend that inflation can be prevented, the rising cost of living halted by the payment of subsidies, without fixing the price of commodities, without holding the line on wages.

In spite of the President's statement that he would hold the line and stabilize wages, if given the power to fix prices—and we gave it to him—many of us knew that because of the political tie-up with certain union leaders it would not be done. The President has not held the line and today he seeks to avoid the consequences of his own failure by charging that Congress, in refusing to vote subsidies, will be responsible for inflation.

Nor is the issue a political one, as shown by the fact that on the vote on the final passage of the bill banning subsidies, 98 Democrats voted for it; only two more voted against it.

Today, under the law which we gave him in January of 1942, the President has authority to prevent an increase in prices—a raise in the cost of living.

This administration insults the intelligence of the people when it says that Congress is responsible for the increase in the cost of living—when we see every day in the press of the country a list of prices which his administrative agencies have fixed. The administration has been fixing prices; it is fixing prices today, and it can continue to do so. If the cost of living goes up, no one but the administration is to blame. The administration has the power to prevent inflation. If for political purposes it insists upon refusing to use its power to halt the rising cost of living, the responsibility rests upon the administration.

It does not need—it does not want—subsidies to halt inflation; it wants subsidies to give an indirect raise in pay to industrial workers.

No, Mr. President, this inflation baby is your baby. It was conceived in the minds of your economic advisers; the midwives who attended its birth were the dreamy-eyed professors and its wet nurses have been, and are, your administrative agencies.

You will not be permitted by lambasting Congress, after it has given you all the power and all the money—except subsidy money for political purposes—for which you have asked, to escape responsibility for a condition which now threatens millions of white-collared workers, and all those who are living on fixed incomes. If they go hungry, the fault is that of your administration. You cannot shift it to Congress.

If because of high prices and low wages our people cannot purchase needed food, why not divert some of the millions of tons which are going to other countries to the feeding of our own people; why not use some of the billions of dollars sent to foreign lands, including South America, for the benefit of our white-collar consumers; why not, for once, begin to think of our own folks?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) for 10 days, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a story by Mr. Reiman Morin, of the Associated Press, with regard to activity of the Thirty-sixth Division overseas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Portsmouth (N. H.) Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNOTSON] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

941. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy,

transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 369. Resolution providing additional funds for the expense of the Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 888). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3664. A bill to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 895). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3621. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 896). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3691. A bill to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart; with amendment (Rept. No. 889). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2390. A bill for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella; with amendment (Rept. No. 890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2457. A bill for the relief of David Hickey Post No. 235 of the American Legion; with amendment (Rept. No. 891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2804. A bill for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips; with amendment (Rept. No. 892). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3157. A bill for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 893). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims: H. R. 3371. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 894). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill H. R. 3710 for the relief of Jacob Wilkes Beasley, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3740. A bill to expedite the issuance of marriage licenses in the District of Columbia to members of the armed services and merchant marine; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3742. A bill to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3743. A bill to permit the use of live decoys in the taking of ducks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide for the teaching of the English language in the German nation after the present war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3744. A bill for the relief of H. B. Gilliam and C. E. Ellis, receivers of the Quantico Co., Inc., for balance of purchase price, rentals, and interest for lands used and occupied by the United States Marine Corps at Quantico, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 3745. A bill for the relief of Steve Hlass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 3746. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain land within Des Moines County, Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3747. A bill for the relief of Marden Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3780. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of 1,000 citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3781. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co., of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 25 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3782. Also, petition of A. F. Louis and 52 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to

enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3783. Also, petition of the Cook Paint & Varnish Co. of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 44 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3784. Also, petition of the American Legion Post, No. 299, of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 125 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3785. Also, petition of the Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co. and signed by 292 citizens of St. Louis, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3786. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Wyandotte County, Kans., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3787. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the employees of the Gorsart Co., of New York City, favoring the adoption of the resolution which provides for the creation by the President of a commission to effectuate a plan to rescue surviving European Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3788. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of E. D. Reagan and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, source of the light that never fails or fades, we would yield the flickering torch of our insufficiency to Thee. Apart from Thee all is darkness and death. In the midst of world conditions that baffle us, of swift social currents which sweep away our strongest bulwarks, of evil forces let loose in the earth whose hideous cruelty stabs our anguished hearts, we confess that the world in which our lot is cast is too much for us; we must find a strength not our own or our feet will slip in this overwhelming flood.

We long for Thy life to flow through our anxious and weary hearts. Into Thy brooding presence we would lift up in this hallowed moment the thronging duties which haunt us day and night, the grievous problems affecting Thy children in all the world for which our human wisdom finds no answer. Anoint and cheer our soiled face with the abundance of Thy grace. Strengthen our faith in each other. Heal the divisions which shorten the arm of our national might in this dread hour. Guard our lips from chilling criticism which may wound some comrade plodding

bravely by our side. Bring our spirits into captivity to that which is high and holy and of good report. Spurning and scorning the unworthy may we rejoice only in the fair and fragrant virtues of an honor untarnished. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 26, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR BARBOUR BY JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement issued by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States embodying a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States in tribute to our late beloved colleague, Senator Barbour. The resolution emphasizes the contribution by my late colleague to the fight against intolerance, and his efforts in behalf of Jewish war veterans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW YORK.—The memory of the late Senator W. Warren Barbour, United States Senator from New Jersey, was honored "as a loyal American and as a true friend of all minorities" by a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, it was announced by Archie H. Greenberg, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans.

The resolution pointed out that Senator Barbour had introduced a recent bill to admit 100,000 refugees into the United States; that he had introduced another bill to bar subversive literature from the mails; that he was cochairman with William Allen White of the Council Against Intolerance; and that he had introduced a resolution in the Senate to grant the Jewish War Veterans its national charter.

The resolution, copies of which were sent to the family of Senator Barbour and the United States Senate, follows:

"Whereas the late W. Warren Barbour, United States Senator from New Jersey, was a loyal American and a true friend of all minorities; and

"Whereas in his long career of public service he consistently espoused legislative action